



Library of the Theological Seminary,  
PRINCETON, N. J.

*Presented by - E. A. Baker - 1883*

*Division.....*

*Section .....*

*Shelf.....*

*Number.....*

SCC  
2356  
V. 2







AN  
H I S T O R Y  
OF  
EARLY OPINIONS  
CONCERNING  
J E S U S C H R I S T,  
COMPILED FROM  
ORIGINAL WRITERS;  
PROVING THAT THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH WAS  
AT FIRST UNITARIAN.

By JOSEPH PRIESTLEY, LL.D. F.R.S.

AC. IMP. PETROP. PARIS. HOLM. TAURIN. AUREL. MED.  
PARIS. CANTAB. AMERIC. ET PHILAD. SOCIUS.

V O L. II.

*Vana Philosophorum verba, quæ in doctrinis Platoniciis ecclesiæ  
parvulos interimebant.* JEROM.

B I R M I N G H A M,  
PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR, BY PEARSON AND ROLLASON,  
AND SOLD BY J. JOHNSON, NO. 72, ST. PAUL'S  
CHURCH-YARD, LONDON.  
MDCCLXXXVI.



# C O N T E N T S

OF THE

## SECOND VOLUME.

### B O O K I.

**T**HE History of Opinions which preceded  
the Doctrine of the Divinity of Christ,  
and which prepared the Way for it.  
[Continued.] Page 1

#### C H A P T E R VIII.

*Of the Platonism of Philo.* ibid.

### B O O K II.

Containing the History of the Doctrine of  
the Trinity. 23

#### C H A P T E R I.

*Of Christian Platonism.* ibid.

#### C H A P T E R II.

*Of the Generation of the Son from the Fa-  
ther.* 44

iv C O N T E N T S.

SECTION I.

*The Doctrine of the Platonizing Fathers concerning the Generation of the Son, as the second Person in the Trinity, stated. Page 44*

SECTION II.

*Authorities for this Opinion from Justin Martyr to Origen. 53*

SECTION III.

*Authorities from Origen, and other Writers subsequent to him; with an Account of other Attributes of the Father, besides that of Wisdom, which Christ is said to have been. 68*

CHAPTER III.

*The Defence of the preceding Doctrine by the Fathers. 86*

SECTION I.

*The Generation of the Son from the Father illustrated by the uttering of Words. 88*

SECTION II.

*The Generation of the Son from the Father illustrated by the prolation of a Branch of a Tree from the Root, &c. 100*

# C O N T E N T S. v

## SECTION III.

*Why only one Son was generated, the Objection of Generation implying Passion considered, and why the Son and Holy Spirit did not generate, &c.* Page 115

## SECTION IV.

*Whether the Generation of the Son was in Time, and also whether it was a voluntary or involuntary Act of the Father.* 128

## CHAPTER IV.

*The inferiority of the Son to the Father, shewn to have been the Doctrine of all the Antenicene Fathers.* 145

## CHAPTER V.

*Of the Power and Dignity of Christ as the pre-existing Logos of the Father.* 172

## CHAPTER VI.

*Christ, beside being the Logos of the Father, was thought to have a proper human Soul.* 198

CHAP-

vi      C O N T E N T S.

C H A P T E R   V I I .

*Of the Union between the Logos, and the Soul  
and Body of Christ, and their separate pro-  
perties.*      Page 224

S E C T I O N   I .

*Of this Union in general.*      ibid.

S E C T I O N   I I .

*Of the Ignorance of Christ concerning the Day  
of Judgment.*      234

S E C T I O N   I I I .

*Opinions concerning the Body of Christ.*      246

C H A P T E R   V I I I .

*Of the Use of the Incarnation, and the Objec-  
tions that were made to the Doctrine.*      258

C H A P T E R   I X .

*Of the Controversy relating to the Holy  
Spirit.*      268

S E C T I O N   I .

*Opinions concerning the Holy Spirit before the  
Council of Nice.*      270

S E C -

C O N T E N T S.      vii

SECTION II.

*Opinions concerning the Holy Spirit after the  
Council of Nice.*      Page 285

SECTION III.

*Of the proper Office of the Spirit with respect  
to the Offices of the Father and the Son.*      299

SECTION IV.

*Of the Arguments for the Divinity of the Holy  
Spirit.*      317

CHAPTER X.

*Of the Doctrine of the Trinity after the Coun-  
cil of Nice.*      335

SECTION I.

*The Doctrine of the perfect Equality of all the  
Persons in the Trinity.*      339

SECTION II.

*Of the New Language introduced at and after  
the Council of Nice.*      351

SECTION III.

*Illustrations of the Doctrine of the Trinity.*      362

C H A P -

# viii C O N T E N T S.

CHAPTER XI.	
<i>Of the Arguments by which the Doctrine of the Trinity was defended.</i>	Page 392

SECTION I.	
<i>Arguments from the Old Testament.</i>	ibid.

SECTION II.	
<i>Arguments from the New Testament.</i>	418

SECTION III.	
<i>Answers to Objections.</i>	428

## V O L. II.

### E R R A T A.

N. B. (b) signifies *from the bottom of the page.*

Page 2. line 14.	<i>for his and he, read their and they</i>
— 29. line 7.	<i>for its, read their</i>
— 75. line 12.	<i>for omnipotent, read omnipresent</i>
— 90. line 13.	<i>for being, read beings</i>
— 139. line 3.	<i>(b) for maxims, read maxim</i>
— 154. line 8.	<i>for seal, read son</i>
— 271. line 7.	<i>(b) for Jesus, read of Jesus</i>
— 272. line 6.	<i>(b) for after, read with</i>
— 296. line 10.	<i>for why, read how</i>
— 352. line 7.	<i>(b) for with, read says that with</i>
— 365. line 5.	<i>(b) for between, read with</i>
— 377. line 3.	<i>dele says</i>
— 412. line 8.	<i>(b) for said, read is said</i>
— 413. line 6.	<i>for probably, read justly.</i>

## THE

### R E F E R E N C E S.

Page 6. note last, line 1.	<i>for Δι αυ, read Δι α</i>
— 34. note † 1. 2.	<i>for οισι κοινοισματι, read οιον εικοινοισματι</i>
— 85. note * line 1.	<i>for εν, read εν</i>
— 95. note * line 1.	<i>for παρ, read προς</i>
— 114. note * line 2.	<i>for συζητιστως, read συζητεις</i>
— 215. note * line 4.	<i>for μετεχουσ, read μετεχοντες</i>



THE  
HISTORY OF OPINIONS  
CONCERNING  
CHRIST.

---

BOOK I:  
THE HISTORY OF OPINIONS WHICH PRE-  
CEDED THE DOCTRINE OF THE DIVI-  
NITY OF CHRIST, AND WHICH PRE-  
PARED THE WAY FOR IT. [CONTINUED]

---

CHAPTER VIII.

*Of the Platonism of Philo.*

IT has been seen that among the heathen Platonists, we have found no uniform and serious personification of the divine *nous*, or *logos*, so that it could be considered as a *distinct intelligent person*, but only strong figures, and a dark enigmatical description of the *ideas*, or the supposed *place of ideas* in the divine mind, constituting what they

called the *intelligible world*, or the world to be perceived by the mind, and not by the senses; and which was an exemplar, or pattern, to the visible world. Upon the whole, it may be asserted that the Platonists themselves proceeded no farther than to what may be called a strongly figurative personification of the divine intellect, considered as distinct either from the Divine Being himself, or those more excellent qualities from which he was denominated *the good*; so that it cannot be said that, if the Platonists had been seriously interrogated concerning his real opinion, he would have answered, that *the good*, and his *nous*, or *logos*, were two distinct intelligent persons, each having ideas, and being capable of reasoning and acting, though their language, literally interpreted, will occasionally bear that construction.

In Philo, a Jew of Alexandria, who was cotemporary with the apostles, we find something more nearly approaching to a real personification of the *logos*, a term which is much more frequent with him than with the Platonists themselves; and  
indeed

indeed it was observed, that what they called *nous*, the barbarians called *logos*, which is a literal translation of the Chaldee מַלְאָךְ. Philo says so much concerning *ideas*, and *the intelligible world*, and is withal so eloquent, that it has been justly observed, “either that Plato philonized, or that Philo “platonized\*,” but he was far from advancing so far as the platonizing christians. However, though he did not, like them, make a *permanent intelligent person* of the divine *logos*, he made an *occasional* one of it, making it the visible medium of all the communications of God to man, that by which he both made the world, and also conversed with the patriarchs of the Old Testament.

It will be seen that Philo’s own ideas were far from being clear, or consistent, but he is much less confused than the proper heathen Platonists, and he sometimes exhibits a platonism of a simple, and less figurative kind. Thus, after observing that

\* Τὸσαύτον δ’ αὐτὸν τοῖς ἐλλήνεσσι παρὰσχειν δαυμά της ἐν τοῖς λόγοις δυναμείας, ὡς καὶ λεγεῖν αὐτὸς, ἡ Πλάτων φιλωνίζει ἡ φιλὼν πλατωνίζει. Phot. Bib. sect. 105. p. 278.

“ an architect constructs a building after an  
 “ idea which he has previously formed of  
 “ of it in his mind,” he says, “ in like  
 “ manner, we must judge concerning God,  
 “ who, intending to build a magnificent  
 “ city, first devised the plan of it, from  
 “ which he formed the visible world, using  
 “ it as a pattern. As the pre-conceived  
 “ plan of the building in the mind of an  
 “ architect has no existence externally, but  
 “ is stamped upon the mind of the artist,  
 “ in like manner this *world of ideas* has no  
 “ place but the divine logos, which dis-  
 “ poses all things. For what other proper  
 “ place can there be to receive, and contain,  
 “ not only all ideas, but even a single idea.  
 “ It is a world creating power, which has  
 “ its source in the *true good*\*.” In another

\* Τα παραπλησια ὅη καὶ περὶ θεῶν δοξάζουσιν, οὗ αἶψα τὴν μεγαλοπο-  
 λιν κίττειν διανοήσεις, ἐνενοήσε πρότερον τῆς τυτῆς αὐτῆς, ἐξ ᾧ κόσμον  
 νοήλον συστήσας, ἀποείλει τὸν αἰδήλον, παραδειγματὶ χρωμένῳ  
 ἐκείνῳ. Καθὰ περ ἐν ἡ ἐν τῷ ἀρχιτεκτονικῷ προδιαλυπώδιστα πωλεις,  
 χωρὰν ἐκείνῳ ἔκ εἶχεν, ἀλλ’ ἐνεσφραγίστο τῇ τῆς τεχνικῆς ψυχῇ, τὸν αὐτὸν  
 τρόπον, καὶ ὁ ἐκ τῶν ιδεῶν κόσμος ἄλλον ἂν ἔχοι τόπον, ἢ τὸν θεῖον λόγον  
 τῶν παντῶν διακοσμήσαντα. Ἐπεὶ τις ἂν εἴη τῶν δυνάμεων αὐτῆς τόπος  
 ἕτερος, οὗ γενοῖ ἐν ἱκανῷ, καὶ λέγω πάσας, ἀλλὰ μιὰν ἀκράτον ἣν τίθεν  
 δεῖσθαι τε καὶ χωρῆσαι. Δύναμις δὲ καὶ ἡ κοσμοποιήλικη, πῶς ἔχου-  
 σα τὸ πρὸς ἀληθεῖαν ἀγαθόν. De Mundi Opificio, p. 4.

passage,

passage also, speaking of the different significations of *place*, he says that “one of them is the divine logos, the whole of which God himself has filled with incorporeal powers\*.” In this place the logos is evidently nothing more than the divine mind itself, or the seat of his ideas; and the *true good*, in the former passage, in which the creative power is said to reside, is the platonic term for the Supreme Being.

Like the other Platonists, Philo does not, however, content himself with giving these *ideas*, or *the intelligible world*, which is composed of them, a place in the divine mind, or *logos*, but he also confounds them with the logos. “To speak plainly,” says he, “the ideal world is no other than the logos of God, who makes the world, nor is an ideal city any other than the reasoning of the architect intending to produce it †.” Agreeable to this use of the

\* Κατα δευτερον δε τροπον. ο θειος λογος ου εκπεπληρωκεν ολον διελων ασωματοις δυναμεσιν αυτος ο θεος. De Somniis, p. 574.

† Ει δε τις εδελησειε γυμνολεροις χρησασθαι τοις ονομασιν, εδεν αν ελερον ειποι τον νοητον ειναι κοσμον η δεε λογον ηδη κοσμοποιουν. Ουδε γαρ η νοητη πολις ετερον τι εστιν, η ο τε αρχιτεκτονος λογισμος ηδη την νοητην πολιν ηλιζειν διανοουμενα. De Mundi Opificio, p. 5.

term *logos*, as synonymous to the *ideal world*, he says, “The imitation of a perfectly beautiful pattern, must be perfectly beautiful; but the *logos* of God must be more excellent than beauty itself, as it is in nature, without any additional beauty\*.”

So far this writer is tolerably intelligible, and so also he is in the following passage, in which he speaks of the ideal world as formed by a power inherent in the divine mind. Speaking of God saying, *Adam will be like one of us*, he says, “Though God be one, he has many powers. By these powers the intelligible and incorporeal world is made, the archetype of that which is visible, consisting of invisible ideas, as this does of visible bodies†.”

\* Αναγκη δε παγκαλι παρδειγματὸ παῖκαλον εἶναι μιμημα. Θεοῦ δὲ λογος, καὶ αὐτὸ καλλος, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ φύσει καλλος, ἀμεινων, καὶ κοσμημενος καλλεῖ· κοσμος δ' αὐτος ὧν, εἰ δὲ ταληδες εἴπειν, εκπρεπετατος ἐκεῖνος. De Mundi Opificio, p. 32.

\* Εἰς ὧν ὁ θεος ἀμυδηλὲς περὶ αὐτὸν ἔχει δυνάμεις. Δι' αὐτῶν δυνάμεων ὁ ἀσώματος καὶ νοητὸς ἐπάγει κοσμος, τὸ τε φαινόμενον τεδὲ ἀρχετυπον, ἰδέαισι ἀοράτοις συτάδει, ὥσπερ ὕλος σωμασιν ὁράτοις. De Confusione Linguarum, p. 345.

In one passage he speaks of these divine powers by which the invisible world is made as *two*, but he does not explain himself with respect to that particular number. “God,” says he, “being one, has two supreme powers. By these powers the incorporeal and ideal world is made, the archetype of the visible world, consisting of invisible ideas, as this is visible to the eyes\*.” He likewise speaks of the divine logos as “flowing from the fountain of wisdom like a river†.” But in the following passage he makes the logos to be the same with *wisdom*, and thereby makes a nearer approach to the ideas of the christian Fathers. Allegorizing the rivers of paradise, he says concerning one of them, that “it is the river which is productive of goodness. It proceeds from the wisdom of God,

\* Εἰς ὧν ὁ θεὸς δύο τὰς ἀνώταταις δυνάμεις ἐχει. Διὰ τῶν τῶν δυνάμεων, ὁ ἀσώματος καὶ νοητὸς ἐπαγὴ κόσμος τὸ τε φαινόμενον τεθε ἀρχέλυτον, ἰδέαις ἀρρατοῖς συσταθεῖς ὡσπερ εἰς ὁμμασιν οὐρατοῖς. De Mundo, p. 1150.

† Καλεῖται δὲ ὡσπερ ἀπο πηγῆς τῆς σοφίας πλάμας τροπον ὁ θεῖος λόγος. De Somniis, p. 1141.

“ which is the *logos* of God ; for according  
 “ to this its productive power is made\*.”

But in another place he makes the *logos* to be different from this *wisdom*, which he makes to be the mother of the *logos* ; and this circumstance may, perhaps, throw some light upon the *two divine powers*, by which, in the passage quoted above, he said that the intelligible world was made. Allegorizing Moses’s description of the high priest, he says, “ This high priest does not mean a  
 “ man, but the *logos* of God, free from all  
 “ sin, voluntary or involuntary. When  
 “ Moses forbids him to defile himself on  
 “ account of his father the *nous*, or his mo-  
 “ ther the *senses*, I think that he must have  
 “ parents incorruptible and holy ; his fa-  
 “ ther God, who is also the father of all,  
 “ and his mother *wisdom*, by which every  
 “ thing was produced†.” In this figura-

\* Πολύμορος ἡ γενικὴ ἐστὶν ἀγαθότης. Αὕτη ἐκπορεύεται ἐκ τῆς τῆ θεοῦ σοφίας. Ἡ δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς λόγος. καὶ γὰρ τῶν πεποιητῶν ἡ γενεὴ ἀρετῇ. De Mundi Opificio, p. 52.

† Λεγομεν γὰρ τὸν ἀρχιερεᾶ, ἐκ ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ λόγον θεῖον εἶναι, πάντων οὐκ ἐκστῶν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκρίτων ἀδικημάτων ἀμειλοχόν. εἴτε γὰρ ἐπὶ πάλαι τῷ νῦν, εἴτε ἐπὶ μήλοι τῇ αἰσθησεί φησὶν αὐτὸν Μωυσῆος  
 δυνασδαι



tive and confused manner does Philo at length come to what may be called an intermediate principle between God and the creation. This logos he also calls “the  
 “ *image of God*, by which all the world was  
 “ made\*

Having got an *image of God*, he likewise makes an image of this image; but his explanation of this I do not pretend fully to understand. Having called “the invisible  
 “ and intelligible world the divine logos,  
 “ or the logos of God, the image of God,  
 “ and the image of that intelligible light  
 “ which was the image of that divine logos,  
 “ which explains its origin, It is,” he says,  
 “ that super-celestial star, which is the

δυνασθαι μαινεσθαι, διότι οἱ μαι γονεων ἀφθάρτων ἢ καθαρῶτατων ελαχεν, παῖρος μὲν θεῶ, οὗ ἢ τῶν συμπαντῶν ἐστὶ παῖς, μήρος δὲ σοφίας, δι ἧς τὰ ὅλα ἦλθεν εἰς γενεσιν. De Profugis, p. 466.

Those who are offended at the allegorical method of interpreting the scriptures in Origen, and the other christian Fathers, should be informed that it is not peculiar to them, nor did it originate with them. Philo is as extravagant as any of them in the scope that he gave to his imagination in this way.

\* Λογος δὲ ἐστὶν εἰκὼν θεῶ, δι ἧς συμπας ὁ κόσμος ἐδημιουργεῖτο. De Monarchia, p. 823.

“ source of the visible stars, and which may  
 “ be called the universal splendor, from  
 “ which the sun, moon, and stars, fixed or  
 “ wandering, derive their respective splen-  
 “ dors \*.”

But beside making the logos to be the image of God, Philo gives it an occasional real personification, and makes it to be the medium of the divine communications to mankind, the symbol of the divine presence, and even to assume the form of an angel, or a man. “ Though no person,” he says, “ is worthy to be called the Son  
 “ of God, endeavour to be accomplished  
 “ like his first begotten logos, the most  
 “ ancient angel, as being the archangel of  
 “ many names ; for it is called the αρχη”  
 [the beginning or principle] “ the name of  
 “ God, and the logos, and the man accord-  
 “ ing to his image, and the seer of Israel.

\* Του δε αορατον κ' υψηλον θειον λογον, κ' θεος λογον, εικονα λεγει θεος. Και ταυτης εικονα το νοητον φως εκεινο, ο θεος λογος γεγονεν, εικων τα διεμνηνυσταυτος την γενεσιν αυτη. Και εστιν υπερβαρυνος αστηρ, πηγη των αισθητων ασερων. Ην εκ απο σκοπης καλεσειεν αν τις πανταυγειον, αφ ης ο ηλιος κ' η σεληνη κ' οι αλλοι πλανηται τε κ' απλανεις, αρουσιαι καθ' οσον εκασω δυναμις, τα πρεποντα φειγη. De Mundi Opificio, p. 6.

“ For

“ For if we are not worthy to be called the  
 “ sons of God, let us be so of his eternal  
 “ image, the most holy logos; for this most  
 “ ancient logos is the image of God.\*.”

Philo supposed that it was this divine logos that had its place between the cherubims in the *Holy of Holies*, but was there invisible. Having described the propitiatory and the cherubims, he says, “ that the  
 “ divine logos is above these, having no  
 “ visible form, as not falling under the  
 “ senses; but is the express image of God,  
 “ the oldest of all intelligible things, and  
 “ there is no medium between it and the  
 “ supreme power.” He then compares it to the charioteer, acting by the command of the person who is carried in the car †.

\* Καν μηδεπω μεντοι τυχανη τις αξιοχρεως ων υιος θεου  
 προσαγορευεσθαι, σπεσδαζε κοσμεισθαι καλα τον πρωτογονον  
 αυτε λογον, τον αγγελον πρεσβυαλον, ως αρχαγγελον πολυω-  
 νυμον υπαρχοντα, κη γαρ αρχη, κη ονομα θεου, κη λογος, κη  
 ο καλ εικονα ανθρωπος, κη ορων Ισραηλ προσαγορευεται. Και  
 γαρ ει μηπω ικανοι θεου παιδες νομιζεσθαι γεγωναμεν, αλλα  
 τοι της αιδης εικονος αυτε λογου τε ιερωατε. Θεου γαρ εικων,  
 λογος ο πρεσβυαλος. De Confusione Linguarum, p. 341.

† Ο δ' υπερανω τετων λογος θειος, εις ορατην εκ ηλθεν  
 ιδεαν, αλλε μηδενι των καλ αισθησιν εμφορης ων, αλλ' αυτος  
 εικων

Calling God the Father, he calls the *logos* the Son. Having spoken of the high priest as standing before the holy of holies with his breast-plate, which represented the *logos*, he says, it was necessary that he who officiated as priest to the Father of the world should have his most accomplished Son as an advocate \*.

Having represented the supreme Being in the character of a shepherd and a king, ordering and conducting all the parts of nature, earth, water, fire, plants, animals, the heavenly bodies, &c. he describes the *logos* as his *first begotten Son*, superintending all these things, as an officer under

εικὼν ὑπαρχὸν θεῷ, τῶν νοήτων ἀπαξάπαρτῶν ὁ πρεσβυτέριος, ὁ ἐξουσίᾳ, μηδεὸς οὐλὸς μεθορίας διασημαίος, τε μόνῃ ὁ εἶναι ἀφένδως ἀριδρυμένος. λεγέσθαι γὰρ ἑλληνιστῶ σοι ἀνῶθεν τε ἰλαστικῇ σὺν μεσῶν τῶν δυοῖν χερσίν, ὡς δὲ ἡνιοχὸν μὲν εἶναι τῶν δυνάμεων τὸν λόγον, ἐπιτοχὸν δὲ τὸν λαλήντα ἐπικελευόμενον τῷ ἡνιοχῷ τὰ πρὸς ὀρθὴν τε πάντος ἡνιοχίαν. De Profugis, p. 465.

\* Τὰς ἐπὶ τῶν σεπτῶν δωδεκά λιθὸς ἐκ τριῶν κατὰ τεττάρας σειρὰς, τε συνεχοίης καὶ δικαιοῦς λόγῳ το σὺμπαν, το λογιν. σταγματικὸν γὰρ ἦν τὸν ἐρωμενὸν τῷ τε κόσμῳ πάλρι, παρὰ κλητῶ χρῆσθαι τελειοτάτῳ τὴν ἀρετὴν υἱῷ, πρὸς τε ἀμνηστειαν ἀμαρτημάτων, καὶ χορηγίας ἀφθοράσιων αγαθῶν. De Vita Moysi, lib. 3. Opera, p 673.

him,

him, and likewise as the angel that God told Moses he would send before him \*.

The Platonists having been used to call the world *the child*, or *son* of God, Philo calls it, with respect to the logos, the *younger son*; this being the object of the senses, the other being perceived by the mind only, and as the older son, remaining with the Father †.

We likewise find this logos dignified with the appellation of *god*; but to distinguish him from the supreme God, he says, that the latter is known by the term God with the article prefixed to it, *the God*, whereas the logos, like other inferior gods,

\* Καθαπερ γαρ τινα ποιμνην, γην, και υδωρ, και αερα, και πυρ, και οσα εν τετοις φυτα τε αυ και ζωα, τα μεν θνητα, τα δε θεια, επι δε κρανε φυσιν, και ηλις και σπηληνης περιουδες, και των αλλων ασερων τροπας τε αυ και χορειας εναρμονιους, ως ποιμην και βασιλευς ο θεος αγει κατα δικην και νομον, προσησαμενος τον ορδον αυτε λογον πρωτογονον υιον, ος την επιμελειαν της ιερας ταυτης αγγελης, οια τι μεγαλε βασιλεως υπαρχος διαδεξεται. και γαρ ειρηται πα. ιδε εγω ειμι, αποσελω αγγελον με εις προσωπον σε τε φυλαξαι σε εν τη οδω.  
De Agricultura, p. 195.

† Ο μεν γαρ κοσμος ετ' νεώτερος υιος θες, απε αισθητων. τον γαρ πρεσβύτερον τετε κδεναι ειπε νοητ' δ' εκεινος, πρεσβειων δ' αξιωσας, παρ' εαυτω καταμενειν δ' εννοηθη.  
On the Immutability of God, Opera, p. 298.

is only called God without the article. Speaking of the God who appeared to Abraham, he says, “The true God is one, but  
 “those who are figuratively so called are  
 “many; wherefore the sacred word on this  
 “occasion distinguishes the true God by  
 “the article, I am *the* God, but he that is  
 “so called figuratively without the article;  
 “he that appeared to thee in the place, not  
 “of *the* God, but only *of* God. For here  
 “he gives the name of God to his most  
 “ancient logos, not being solicitous about  
 “the name, but respecting the end which  
 “he proposed \*.”

Philo, notwithstanding his Platonism, was so much a Jew, that he ascribed proper *creation* to God the Father only, and the forming of created matter to the logos. “God,” says he, “who made all things,  
 “not only made them to appear, but pro-

\* Ο μὲν ἀληθεὶς θεός, εἷς ἐστίν. οἱ δ' ἐν καὶλαχρησεὶ γινόμενοι, πλείους. διὰ καὶ ὁ ἱερός λόγος ἐν τῷ παρόντι τὸν μὲν ἀληθεῖα, διὰ τὰς ἀρετὰς μεμνηνύκεν, εἰπων. Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεός· τὸν δὲ καὶλαχρησεὶ χωρὶς ἀρετὰς, φασκων, ὁ ὀφθεῖς σοι ἐν τοπῷ, καὶ τὸς θεός, ἀλλὰ αὐτομόνον, θεός. Καλεῖ δὲ τὸν θεόν τὸν πρεσβυτάτον αὐτὴ νυνὶ λόγον, καὶ δεισιδαιμονῶν περὶ τὴν θεσιν τῶν ὀνομαζών. ἀλλ' ἐν τέλος προστεθείμενος παραγματολογησεῖ. De Somniis, p. 599.

“duced what was not before, being not  
 “only a *former*, but a *creator*\*.” But of  
 the logos (according to the likeness of  
 which man was made) he says, that “he,  
 “being produced, imitating his Father, and  
 “regarding his patterns, reduced things  
 “into form†.”

It might be imagined that the Divine Being, by the emission of this logos in so substantial a form, would be deprived of some of his proper power; but to this Philo would probably have replied, that this *second God* was only like a lamp lighted at the original fountain of light, which did not diminish its substance or splendor. For he does apply this comparison (which is so commonly used by the early christian Fathers) to the case of Moses, whose spirit God is said to take from him, in order to impart it to the seventy-two elders. “This,” he says, “is not to be understood

\* Ο θεος τα πάντα γενήσας & μόνον εις τεμψανες ηγαγεν. αλλα κ' α προτερον &κ ην, εποικησεν. & δημιουργος μόνον, αλλα κ' κτιστης αυτος αν. De Somniis, p. 577.

† Ο γενηθείς μεντοι μιμημενος τας τε πατρος εδους προς παραδειγμα αρχέτυπα εκεινς βλέπων, εμορφας ειδη. De Confusione Linguarum, p. 329.

“ as if he suffered any loss thereby, but it  
 “ was like the lighting of one torch by  
 “ another, which is not diminished by that  
 “ means, though ten thousand be lighted  
 “ by it \*.” Or he might have supposed  
 that the loss sustained by the emission of  
 the logos was only temporary, because he  
 thought that the emission of the logos only  
 resembled the emission of light from the  
 sun, which was afterwards drawn into its  
 source again.

According to Philo, angels are nothing  
 more than this divine logos; so that he  
 could not consider them as having a per-  
 manent being. Speaking of Hagar, he says,  
 “ She was met by an angel, which is the  
 “ logos of God, advising her to return to  
 “ her mistress, and encouraging her †.”

\* Δεγνῆναι γὰρ, εἰ ἀφελῶ ἀπο τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἐπὶ σοί, καὶ ἐπιθήσω  
 ἐπὶ τῆς ἐδύμηνου πρεσβυτέρου. ἀλλὰ μὴ νομίσῃς εἶναι τὴν ἀφαιρῆσιν  
 καὶ ἀποκοπὴν καὶ διαζευξίν γινεσθαι, ἀλλὰ οἷα γενοῖν ἂν ἀπὸ πυρός, ὁ  
 καὶ μυρίας δάδας ἐξάψῃ, μένει μηδὲν ἐλαττωθὲν ἐν ὁμοίῳ. De Gi-  
 gantibus, p. 287.

† Σημεῖον δὲ, τοῦ υπαίαν αὐτῇ ἀγγέλων θεῖον λόγον, ἃ χρὴ παραινέσεν-  
 τα, καὶ ὑψηλοῦμενον ἐπανοδὸς τῆς εἰς τὸν διεσποινῆς οἶκον, ὅς καὶ θάρσυνων  
 φησιν, Ἐπήκατε κυριὸς τῇ ταπεινώσει σέ, ἣν εἶε διὰ φόβον ἐσχες, εἶε διὰ  
 μισος. De Profugis, p. 451.

And



And treating of the migration of Abraham, he says, “He that follows God must of necessity make use of the attending *logoi*, “which are commonly called angels\*.”

Thus it is evident, that Philo made a much more substantial personification of the divine logos than any of the proper Platonists had done; and it is very possible, that by the perusal of his writings, the christian Fathers, to whom they could not be unknown, might be led to their still more enlarged system of personification. As Philo had represented the divine logos as being the immediate agent in all the communications of God to the patriarchs, they had nothing to do beside making this logos to be the same with Christ, and their scheme was very nearly completed. But Philo himself was far from imagining that the logos had any more relation to the Messiah than to any other prophet. According to him, it was the medium of the divine communica-

\* Ο δε επομενος θεω, κατα αναγκαιον συνεδωκεν χρηται τοις ακολουθοις αυτου λογους, ως ονομαζειν εθος αγγελους. De Migratione Abraham, p. 415.

tions with the prophets, but was never supposed to reside with any of them, and much less to be inseparably attached to them, or to animate them. The *logos* was still a *divine influence*, or *efflux*, apprehended to be something belonging to the Divine Being, though occasionally emitted from him, and drawn into him again, when the purpose for which it had been emitted was answered. Where Philo ended the doctrine of personification, that of the christian Fathers began. The difference was that, whereas Philo thought the emission of the *logos* to be occasional, and to assume various forms, particularly that of angels, the christian Fathers thought it to be uniform and permanent, and interpreted it of Christ only.

But the first christians who adopted this opinion of the emission of a divine *logos*, or *efflux*, went very little farther than Philo, saying, as Justin Martyr explains their opinion, that this *logos*, which had been that which appeared to Moses and the patriarchs, in the form of a luminous cloud, or *glory*, which had sometimes assumed the form of

a *man*, and constituted what are called *angels*, was likewise in Jesus Christ, and enabled him to work miracles, &c. Since, however, according to their opinion, nothing was emitted from God but what he could at pleasure, draw into himself again, just as a beam of light was supposed to go out of the sun, and go back to its source (without indeed being ever separated from it) they who held it were properly *philosophical unitarians*; and this is the opinion that is ascribed to Marcellus of Ancyra, and other acknowledged unitarians of early times. Athenagoras held this doctrine with respect to the *Holy Spirit*, though he followed Justin Martyr in supposing that, after the emission of the *logos*, before the creation of the world, it always remained *a person*, distinct from the Father, and constituted *the Son*, or *Christ*.

With respect to the Jews, it is evident that, in general, they did not use the term *logos* in the Platonic sense, but as synonymous to *God*, or the mere token, or symbol, of the divine presence. The Chaldee paraphrasts often use the term מִמְרָא, *minra*,

which may be translated *logos*, or *word*, as Gen. i. 27. *The word of the Lord created man*, instead of, *the Lord created man*. Gen. ix. 12. *This is the token of the covenant which I make between my word and you*, instead of *between me and you*. But that, in the ideas of these writers, the *word* of a person was merely synonymous to *himself*, is evident from their application of the same phraseology to man. Thus the same paraphraser says, Numb. xv. 32. *A certain man said in his word, I will go forth and gather sticks on the sabbath-day*, when he could only mean that *he said to himself*, or purposed in his own mind. Ecclef. i. 2. *Solomon said in his word, Vanity of vanities, &c.* 2 Sam. iii. 15, 16. *Phaltiel put a sword between his word and Michal, the daughter of Saul*, i. e. between himself and Michal, as is justly observed by Mr. Lindsey, in the Sequel to his Apology, p. 381.

Phraseology similar to this is used in the book called the *Wisdom of Solomon*; when the author, describing the plagues of Egypt, says, chap. xviii. 15. *Thine Almighty word leaped down from heaven, out of thy royal throne,*

*throne, as a fierce man of war, into the midst of a land of destruction, and brought thine unfeigned commandment, as a sharp sword, and standing up, filled all things with death; and it touched the heavens, but it stood upon the earth.* But that this is only a figurative description of the *power of God*, reaching from heaven to earth, is evident from the language of the whole chapter, where those plagues are ascribed to God, and to no other being whatever, chap. xix. 9. *For they went at large, &c. praising thee, O Lord, who hadst delivered them.*



T H E  
HISTORY OF OPINIONS  
CONCERNING  
C H R I S T.

---

B O O K II.  
CONTAINING THE HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

---

CHAPTER I.  
*Of Christian Platonism.*

HAVING shewn what were the boasted principles of the Platonic school, as held by Plato himself, by his followers about the time of the christian æra, and by Philo ; let us now see what use was made of them by the philosophizing christians, many of whom were educated in the Platonic school of Alexandria, Absurd and confused as the system must

appear to us at this day, it should be considered that it was the only philosophy that was in vogue at the time of the promulgation of christianity ; so that persons of a liberal education could not well be supposed to adopt any other. In that age, the chief subject of deliberation was the choice of a master in philosophy ; and though those who then gave lectures at Alexandria, claimed the privilege of selecting what they thought proper from the systems of all the philosophers, and on that account called themselves *Ecclectics*, the different doctrines were so discordant, that it was not much of any of them that could be adopted into any other.

Accordingly, we find that, with respect to every thing of much consequence, such as the doctrine concerning God, the maker and governor of the world, and the *first principles* of all things, the philosophers of Alexandria were, or pretended to be, wholly Platonists. And it must be allowed that, compared with other systems, there were many things exceedingly specious in the doctrine of Plato, and such as  
would



would render it peculiarly captivating to religious and pious persons, who were shocked with the principles of Aristotle, as leading to atheism, and who revolted at the rigour of the stoics, but were charmed with the *sublimity* of Plato. Also, the air of *mystery* which accompanied his doctrine would not, perhaps, upon the whole, lessen the favourable impression which it was calculated to make upon the mind.

The things which most struck the christians in Platonism, were the doctrine of one God, a being of perfect goodness, that of his universal providence, that of the soul, and its immortality, and that of the improvement of the mind consisting in its resemblance to God, and a kind of union with him. These things pleased the christians so much, that they persuaded themselves that Plato had actually borrowed them from the writings of Moses, with which they said he might have been acquainted during his residence in Egypt, or in his travels in the East. Justin Martyr, and others of the Fathers, insist much upon this. It was on account of this supposed

posed resemblance between Platonism and the doctrine of the scriptures, that this philosophy was thought to be the best preparation for the study of christianity; and that it was even imagined that it was given to the world by a particular providence, as introductory to the christian dispensation. "The Greek philosophy," says Clemens Alexandrinus, "cleanses the mind and prepares it for the reception of faith, on which truth builds knowledge\*." Other extracts will be given from this writer hereafter, which will more clearly shew what his ideas on this subject were.

That christians were really struck with the principles of Platonism above-mentioned, is not a matter of conjecture only, but appears clearly in their writings. M. Felix says, that "according to Plato's *Timæus*, God is the parent of the world, the author of the soul, and the maker of things in heaven and earth. It is nearly," says he, "the same doctrine with our

\* Φιλοσοφία δὲ ἡ Ἑλληνική, οἷον προκαθαίρει καὶ προεθίζει τὴν ψυχὴν εἰς παραιδόχην πίστεως, ἐφ' ἣ τὴν γνῶσιν ἐποικοδομεῖ ἡ ἀληθεία. *Strom.* lib. 7. Opera, p. 710.

“own\*.” Tertullian says that “Plato’s philosophy considers God as caring for all things, as an arbiter and judge†.” Irenæus says that “Plato was more religious than the heretics, in that he acknowledged the same God to be just and good, omnipotent, and a judge‡.” Clemens Alexandrinus commends Plato as having made the end of man to be to resemble God, whereas the stoics said that it was to live according to nature§.” Origen also commends Plato as having made happiness to consist in the greatest likeness to God possible||. Justin Martyr speaks of Plato

\* Platoni itaque in Timeo Deus est ipso suo nomine mundi parens, artifex animæ cœlestium terrenorumque fabricator. Eadem fere et ista quæ nostra sunt. Sect. 19. p. 96.

† Platonici quidem, curantem rerum, et arbitrum, et judicem. Ad Nationes, sect. 2. Opera, p. 54.

‡ Quibus religiosior Plato ostenditur, qui eundem Deum et justum, et bonum, confessus est, habentem potestatem omnium, ipsum facientem judicium. Lib. 3. cap. 45. p. 269.

§ Εντεθεν οι μεν Στωικοι, το τελος της φιλοσοφιας, το ακολουθως τη φυσει ζην, ειρηκασι. Πλατων δε, ομοιωσιν θεω, ως εν τω δευτερω παρητησαμεν Στωικωι. Strom. lib. 5. p. 594.

|| Την δε ευδαιμονιαν ειναυ φησιν ομοιωσιν θεω, καλα το δυναλον. Philocalia, p. 127.

as teaching that the world was made by the word of God, out of the things that Moses spake of, meaning probably the chaos\*, and that the soul of man is immortal†.

The christian writers, however, are ready enough to acknowledge that they did not adopt the principles of Plato indiscriminately. Origen says, that “in some things  
“ philosophy agrees with the law of God,  
“ and in other things is contrary to it; for  
“ many of the philosophers say that there is  
“ one God, who made all things; and some  
“ of them have added, that God made and  
“ governs all things by his word‡.” “In  
“ saying that all things were made and dis-

\* Ωστε λογῶ θεῶ ἐκ τῶν υποκειμένων καὶ προδηλωθέντων διὰ Μωσέως γεγενῆσθαι τὸν πάντα κόσμον, καὶ Πλάτων, καὶ οἱ ταῦτα λεγόντες, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐμαρτομεν, καὶ ὑμεῖς πείσθηται δύνασθε. Apol. i. p. 86.

† Καὶ μὲν Πλάτων, ψυχὴ πάντα ἀθανάτη, κενραγε λεγών. Ad Græcos, p. 7.

‡ Philosophia enim neque in omnibus legi Dei contraria est, neque in omnibus consona. Multi enim philosophorum unum esse Deum, qui cuncta creaverit, scribunt. In hoc consentiunt legi Dei. Aliquantum etiam hoc addiderunt, quod Deus cuncta per verbum suum et fecerit, et regat, et verbum Dei sit quo cuncta moderentur. Opera, vol. i. p. 46.

“ posed

“ posed by God,” Justin Martyr says, “ we  
 “ agree with Plato, and in respect to the con-  
 “ flagration, with the Stoics\*.” And in a  
 later period, when it was perceived that the  
 heretics availed themselves of the principles  
 of Plato, some of the orthodox Fathers were  
 sensible of its mischievous tendency. Thus  
 Jerom says, “ The vain words of the phi-  
 “ losophers, which in the doctrines of  
 “ Plato, kill the infants of the church, are  
 “ turned into divine vengeance and blood to  
 “ them†.”

We have the most direct evidence of some  
 of the most distinguished writers among the  
 christians being charmed with the doctrines  
 of Plato, but especially Justin Martyr, who  
 seems to have been the first who applied the  
 principles of that philosophy to the ad-  
 vancement of the personal dignity of Christ,

\* Τω γαρ λεγειν ημας υπο θεσ παντα κεκοσμεισθαι κ' γεγενησθαι,  
 Πλατωνος δοξομεν λεγειν δυγμα • τω δε εκπυρωσιν γενεσθαι Στωικων.  
 Apol. i. p. 31

† Vana philosophorum verba, quæ in doctrinis Plato-  
 nicis ecclesiæ parvulos interimebant, in ultionem divinam  
 illis conversa est, et in cruorem. In Pf. 77. Opera, vol.  
 7. p. 97.

and to enlarge his sphere of action in the world. Marks of Justin's fondness for this philosophy appear in many parts of his writings; and it is not to be wondered at, as he had been addicted to it before he came to be a christian\*. He says "the notion of incorporeal things, and the doctrine of ideas, charmed me†." What mischief was done to the christian system by this doctrine of *ideas* will presently appear.

Athenagoras taught the Platonic philosophy in public at Alexandria, and almost all the eminent writers among the christians, of that and the following age, are well known either to have been educated there, or to have acquired a fondness for the philosophy that was taught both there and at Athens at the same time.

Austin, speaking of the principles of Plato, says, that "by changing a few words and sentences, the Platonists would become christians, as many of those of later

\* Και γαρ αυτος εγω, τοις Πλατων<sup>Θ</sup> χαιρων διδασκαλι. Apol. 2. p. 127.

† Και με ηρει σφοδρα η των ασωμάλων νοησις, κ<sup>η</sup> η θεωρια των ιδεων ανεπλερε μοι την φρονησιν. Dial. p. 141.

“ times have done \*.” He says that “ he  
 “ learned in some books of the Platonists,  
 “ translated into Latin, though not in so  
 “ many words, the doctrine of the logos,  
 “ as contained in the introduction to the  
 “ gospel of John ; that it was with God,  
 “ and was God, and that the world was  
 “ made by it, &c. but not the doctrine of  
 “ the incarnation †.”

I am ready enough to join with these christian writers in their admiration of many

\* Et paucis mutatis verbis atque sententiis christiani fierent, sicut plerique recentiorum nostrorumque temporum Platonici fecerunt. De Vera Religione, cap. 4. Opera, vol. 1. p. 704.

† Procurasti mihi per quendam hominem immanissimo typho turgidum, quosdam Platoniorum libros ex Græca lingua in Latinam versos : et ibi legi : non quidem his verbis, sed hoc idem omnino multis et multiplicibus suaderi rationibus, quod in principio erat verbum, et verbum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat verbum : hoc erat in principio apud Deum, omnia per ipsum facta sunt, et sine ipso factum est nihil quod factum est : in eo, vita est, et vita erat lux hominum, et lux in tenebris lucet, et tenebræ eam non comprehenderunt. Confess. Opera, vol. 1. p. 128.

Item ibi legi quia Deus verbum non ex carne, non ex sanguine, non ex voluntate viri, non ex voluntate carnis, sed ex Deo natus est. Sed quia verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis non ibi legi. Ibid.

things

things in the philosophy of Plato, compared with other systems existing at the same time, and wish that they could be detached from the rest of the system, in which there is so much confusion and absurdity, as I have clearly pointed out. But, unhappily, these admirers of Plato carried their admiration much too far ; and as we have seen, in the case of Justin and Austin, were more particularly struck with that very part of this system, namely, that concerning the doctrine of *ideas*, and the divine intellect, *nous*, or *logos*, in which the greatest darkness and absurdity belonging to it is found. The reason was, that this part of the system, having been previously adopted by Philo, furnished them with a pretence for representing their master in a more reputable light than that of a *mere man*, who had no higher origin than being born in Judea. In what manner they availed themselves of the doctrine of Plato for this purpose, will be seen after I have represented what they imagined the principles of Plato, with respect to the *logos* and other things connected with it, to have been.

I shall



I shall begin with observing, that even the christian Fathers do not uniformly represent the principles of Platonism as very favourable to their doctrine of the personification of the *logos*. For sometimes they describe those principles as admitting of no more than one proper *mind*, and that belonging to the supreme being, or the first cause, the *second principle* being nothing more than his ideas. “Plato’s three principles,” says Justin Martyr, “are God, “and matter, and idea; God the maker of “all things, matter which was prior to all “production, and which furnished materials “for it, and idea the pattern of every thing “that was made \*.” Clemens Alexandrinus also says, that “Plato considered idea “as the mind of God, the same that barbarians call the *logos* of God †;” and ob-

\* Τε γὰρ Πλάτωνος τρεῖς ἀρχαὶ τὸ πᾶν εἶναι λεγόντος, θεὸν καὶ ὕλην καὶ εἰδόν. θεὸν μὲν, τὸν πᾶντων ποιητήν· ὕλην δὲ, τὴν υποκειμένην τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν γενομένων γενεσεί, καὶ τὴν προφασίν αὐτῷ τῆς δημιουργίας παρεχέσσαν· εἰδόν δὲ, τὸ ἐκαστὸν τῶν γενομένων παραδείγμα. Ad Græcos, p. 7.

† Ἡ δὲ ἰδέα, εἰκονισμὸς τῆς θεᾶς, ὅπερ οἱ βάρβαραι λόγον εἰρημασί τῆς θεᾶς. Strom. lib. i. p. 553.

serving that Plato speaks of one lawgiver, and one master of music, he says, that by this he taught that there is but one logos and one God \*. Tertullian says, that “ according to Plato, ideas are invisible substances, incorporeal, supermundane, divine and eternal, the forms, patterns, and causes of visible things, which are subject to the senses †.” Origen, if the *Philosophumena* be his, expresses this sentiment still more plainly; “ The pattern,” says he, “ is the mind of God, which he also calls *idea*, by attending to which in his mind God made all things ‡.” He also says,

\* Ως καὶ Πλάτων, ἐν τῷ πολιτικῷ, ἐνα τὸν νομοθέτην φησιν· ἐν δὲ τοῖς νόμοις ἐνα τὸν συνεσθῆλα τῶν μουσικῶν· διὰ τεττῶν διδασκῶν τὸν λόγον εἶναι ἐνα, καὶ τὸν θεὸν ἐνα. Strom. lib. 1. p. 356.

† Vult enim Plato esse quasdam substantias invisibiles, incorporeales, supermundiales, divinas, et æternas; quas appellat ideas, id est formas, exempla, et causas naturalium istorum manifestorum, et subjacentium corporalibus sensibus: et illas quidem esse veritates, hæc autem imagines carum. De Anima, sect. 18. p. 276.

‡ Το δὲ παραδειγμα τὴν διανοίαν τε θεὸς εἶναι, οὗ καὶ ἰδεὰν καλεῖ, οἰοῦνται κοινισμαλὶ προσεχῶν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ οὗ θεοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐδημιουργεῖ. *Philosophumena*, p. 110.

“ Plato’s

“ Plato’s three principles are God, matter,  
“ and the pattern \*.”

These appear to me to have been the genuine principles of Platonism, stripped of all figure; and thus understood, no harm could have resulted from them. But this plain state of things would not content the christian philosophers; as nothing could be made of it to favour their great purpose, namely, to make something more of Christ than a mere man, whose existence commenced with his birth. They soon began to dwell more on the personification of the divine *nous* or *logos* (which was originally conceived to be nothing more than a storehouse of ideas) than the Platonists themselves had ever done; and they took an evident pleasure in giving this turn to the principles of Platonism. Indeed, Plato’s doctrines had always been variously interpreted, as Origen has observed. “ How  
“ can he”, says he, “ pretend to know  
“ every thing of Plato, when his inter-  
“ preters differ so much among them-

\* Πλτων αρχας ειναι τε παντος θεον κ̃ υλην κ̃ παραδειγμα. Ibid.  
p. 108.

“ selves \*.” Platonism, therefore, being capable of various constructions, it was natural for the christian Fathers to give it that dress which best suited their purpose.

Justin Martyr, the first of the platonizing christians, did not content himself with that plain and just account of the principles of Platonism, which has been described above, though he does not seem to ascribe so much to Plato as others did. He says, that “ Plato learned from Moses what he “ called a third — principle, viz. the “ spirit (which, Moses said, moved upon “ the face of the waters) for he gives the “ second place to the logos, which was with “ God, and the third to the spirit, which “ is said to have moved upon the waters †.”

There is more of personification in the following account of the principles of Plato by Tertullian: “ We have said that God

\* Η θαρρησει, οτι παντα οιδε τα Ηλιακος • τοσελων εσων διαφανων κη παρα τοις διηγμενοις αυτα. In Celsus, lib. i. p. 11.

† Και το ειπειν αυτον τριτον, επειδη, ως προειπομεν, επαινω των υδατων ανεγνω υπο Μωσεως ειρημενον επιφερεσθαι το τε δεσ πνευμα. δευτεραν μεν γαρ χωραν τω παρα δεσ λογω, ον πεχιασθαι εν τω παντι εφη, διδωσι • την κη τριτην, τω λεχθεντι επιφερεσθαι τω υδατι πνευματι, ειπων. Apol. i. p. 87.

“ formed

“ formed the world by his word, reason,  
 “ and power. According to your philo-  
 “ sopher, also, the *logos*, that is, the *sermo*,  
 “ and *ratio*, was the maker of the universe.  
 “ Zeno calls him the person that formed  
 “ all things. The same which is called  
 “ *fate*, and *God*, and the *mind of Jupiter*,  
 “ and the *necessity of all things*\*.” Origen  
 says, the Brachmans acknowledged the *logos*  
 for a God †.

Constantine, commending the doctrine of  
 Plato, says, that “ besides the principal  
 “ God, he made a *second God*, subservient  
 “ to him, being two in number, but both  
 “ one in perfection; the substance of the  
 “ second god being derived from that of  
 “ the principal one, and being the imme-  
 “ diate maker and governor of all things,

\* Jam ediximus Deum universitatem hanc mundi verbo  
 et ratione et virtute molitum. Apud vestros quoque sa-  
 pientes, ΛΟΓΟΝ, id est, sermonem atque rationem constat  
 artificem videri universitatis. Hunc enim Zeno determi-  
 nat factitorem, qui cuncta in dispositione formaverit.  
 Eundem et fatum vocari, et deum, et animum Jovis, et  
 necessitatem omnium rerum. Apol. sect. 21. p. 19.

† Αλλ' εστιν αυτοις θεος λογος. Philosophumena, p. 159:

Τελον δε τον λογον, εν θεου ονομαζουσιν. Ibid. p. 164.

“ subject to the order of the first, and re-  
 “ ferring the origin of all things to him.  
 “ The logos himself being God, is likewise  
 “ the son of God. For what other appel-  
 “ lation besides that of *son* can be given  
 “ him, without great impiety? For he  
 “ who is the father of all is justly called  
 “ the father of his own logos. So far  
 “ Plato thought justly \*.”

Thus it should seem, that as christians advanced in their doctrine of the personification of the logos, they ascribed it to Plato with more confidence than those who had gone before them. “ You speak,” says Austin, “ of a Father and his Son, “ whom you call the divine intellect, or “ mind, and the middle principle between “ these, by whom we suppose you mean

\* Υπελάβε δε τὸν καὶ δευτερον· καὶ δυο υἱας τῷ ἀριθμῷ διειλε, μίας υἱας τῆς ἀμφότερων τελειότητος, τῆς τε υἱας τὴν δευτεράν δὲ τὴν ὑπαρξίν ἐχούσης ἐκ τῶ πρώτου· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ δημιουργὸς καὶ διοικήτης τῶν ὅλων, δηλονότι ὑπερανάβεσθηκος· ὁ δὲ μετ' ἐκείνου, ταῖς ἐκείνου προσάξεσιν ὑπεργήσας. τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς τῶν παύλων συστάσεως εἰς ἐκεῖνον ἀναπεμπει.

Ὁ δὲ λόγος αὐτὸς θεὸς ὢν, αὐτὸς τυγχάνει καὶ δευτερίας. παῖον γὰρ ἂν τις ὀνόμα αὐτῷ περιήθει παρὰ τὴν προσηγορίαν τῶν παίδων, ἐκ ἂν τὰ μέγιστα ἐξαμαρτάνοι· ὁ γὰρ τοι τῶν παύλων πατήρ, καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν λόγῳ δικαίως ἂν πατήρ νομίζετο. Μεχρὶ μὲν ἐν τῇ Πλάτων σφῆρῳ ἦν. Oratio, cap. 9. p. 684.

“ the

“ the holy spirit ; and, after your manner,  
 “ you call them three gods \*.” But it has  
 been seen that what the Platonists generally  
 meant by the *son*, or the *child*, was the vi-  
 sible world.

However, the later christian writers had  
 no more doubt about the principles of Plato  
 than about their own, and it is remarkable,  
 how very nearly they make them approach to  
 each other. Cyril of Alexandria asserts, that  
 “ Plato says, it is plain that the first God is  
 “ immoveable, but the second, on the con-  
 “ trary, is in motion. The first is em-  
 “ ployed about intelligible things, the se-  
 “ cond about things intelligible and sen-  
 “ sible†.” Again he says, “ Plato calls  
 “ the supreme God *the good*, and says that

\* Prædicas patrem et ejus filium, quem vocas paternum  
 intellectum seu mentem : et horum medium, quem puta-  
 mus te dicere spiritum sanctum, et more vestro appellas  
 tres Deos. De Civitate Dei, lib. 10. cap. 29. Opera,  
 vol. 5. p. 589.

† Εἰσι δὲ ἔτι οἱ βίοι, ὁ μὲν πρῶτος, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος θεός· ὁ μὲν πρῶτος θεός ἐστι ἐσῶς, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος ἐμπραγιν ἐστὶ κινῆμενος. ὁ μὲν ἐν πρῶτος, περὶ τὰ νοήσια· ὁ δὲ δεύτερος περὶ τὰ νοήσια καὶ αἰσθησια.  
 Contra Julianum, lib. 3. Juliani Opera, vol. 2. p. 98.

“ *nous*, the immediate maker of the world,  
 “ sprung from him, the first God being  
 “ immoveable. He also introduces a third,  
 “ viz. the soul, by which he says every  
 “ thing was moved and animated\*.”

Lastly, in his account of the principles of Plato, after speaking of *the good*, he says,  
 “ From him is generated *nous* (which is  
 “ perfected by the contemplation of him)  
 “ whom they call a second God, and the  
 “ maker of the world. Him they make  
 “ subordinate, and place in the second rank.  
 “ The third they make the soul of the  
 “ world, which had nothing from itself,  
 “ but is made more divine by its relation  
 “ to the *nous*, and stronger with respect to  
 “ its quickening power.†.” He says that

\* Ο γυν Παλίων θεον μεν τον ανωτατω φησι τ' αγαθον εξ αυτου γε μνη αναλαμψαι νεν, κ' τελον ειναι τον προσεχη τω κοσμω δημιουργον ουτος κ' εν ακινησια τε παρως. κ' τριτην εισφερει ψυχην, υφ' ης τα παντα κινεισθαι τε κ' εψυχωσθαι φησι. Contra Julianum, lib. 4. Juliani Opera, vol. 2. p. 147.

† Τελον δε ειναι φησι τ' αγαθον. εξ αυτου γε μνη γενεσθαι νεν, τη προς αυτον θεωρια τελειωμενον, ον δη κ' δευτερον ονομαζεσι θεον, κ' προσεχη τε κοσμω δημιουργον. κ' τελον υποβιβασει, κ' εν δευτερα ταξει τε παρως καταλογιζονται. κ' μνη κ' τριτην λογοποιεσι τε κοσμος ψυχην, οικουμην μεν το αριως εχειν λαχεσαν εδαμως, σχεσει γε μνη τη προς τον κρειττιον



“Prophyry, explaining the doctrine of  
 “Plato, extends the divine essence to three  
 “hypostases ; the first being the Supreme  
 “Being, or *the good* ; the second the de-  
 “miurgus ; and third the soul of the world,  
 “extending the divinity even to this prin-  
 “ciple \*.”

As the christians were admirers of Platonism, so we find that some of the Platonists were admirers of that part of the christian system which was formed after the model of Plato ; and that they were particularly struck with the introduction to the gospel of John, as interpreted by the Platonic christians. Basil, speaking of the first verses of John’s gospel, says, that he knew many heathen philosophers, who admired them, and copied them into

κρείττονα νυν διόλεραν ἀπολεσάμενην, καὶ πρὸς γε το δυνάσθαι ζωοποιεῖν ἐξωμένεσθαι. Ibid. lib. 8. vol. 2. p. 270.

\* Πορφύριος γὰρ φησι, Πλάτων ὁ ἐκλήθεμενος δοξάζει, ἀκριβῶς τριῶν ὑποστάσεων, τὴν τε δεῖξ προελθεῖν εἶναι • εἶναι δὲ τὸν μὲν ἀνωτάτω θεὸν ταχάθον • μετ’ αὐτὸν δὲ καὶ δευτέρον τὸν δημιουργόν • τρίτον δὲ καὶ τὴν τε κοσμοψυχὴν. ἀκριβῶς γὰρ ψυχῆς, τὴν διόλεον προελθεῖν. Con. Jul. lib. 1. Juliani Opera, vol. 2. p. 34. He repeats the same, p. 271.

their

their own writings\*.” Austin says that a  
 “ Platonic philosopher, said that the intro-  
 “ duction to John’s gospel ought to be  
 “ written in letters of gold, and hung up  
 “ in all churches†.” Theodoret says that  
 Plutarch, Numenius, and others, after the  
 appearance of our Saviour, inserted in their  
 own discourses many things from the chris-  
 tian theology‡.

Upon the whole, it must appear that, in  
 representing the principles of Platonism,  
 the christian Fathers leaned too much to  
 the object which they had in view, and

\* Ταῦτα οἶδα πολλὰς καὶ τῶν ἐξω τε λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας μεγά φρο-  
 νητῶν ἐπὶ σοφίᾳ κοσμητῇ, καὶ θαυμασιότητι καὶ τοῖς ἐαυτῶν συνιστήμασιν  
 ἐγκολαλεῖται τολμησιότητις. Hom. 16. Opera, vol. 1. p. 432.

† Quod initium sancti evangelii, cui nomen est secundum  
 Joannem, quidem Platonicus.—Aureis literis conscriben-  
 dum, et per omnes ecclesias in locis eminentissimis propo-  
 nendum esse dicebat. De Civitate Dei, lib. 10. cap. 29.  
 Opera, vol. 5. p. 592.

‡ Καὶ εἰσὶν δὲ πλείους εἰρηλαὶ καὶ τέλω, καὶ Πιλάρχω, καὶ Νερμινῳ,  
 καὶ τοῖς ἀλλοῖς ὅσοι τῆς τέλων ἐπιμετορίας. μὲν γὰρ ὅτι τὴν τε Σωτῆρος  
 ἡμῶν ἐπιφάνειαν εἶσι γενόμενοι τῆς χριστιανικῆς θεολογίας πολλὰ τοῖς  
 οἰκείοις ἀνέμιζον λόγοι. De Græcis Affectibus, Disp. 2. vol.  
 4. p. 750. Ed. Lipsiæ.

made

made more of the personification of the divine *nous*, or *logos*, than the Platonists themselves had ever done. The latter probably meant nothing more than a mere figure of speech, when they spake of the *nous*, or *logos*, as a person; but in the hands of the christian Fathers, it became a substantial *second God*, at first derived from the Supreme Being, dependent upon his will, and subject to his orders, but afterwards in all respects equal to himself.

## C H A P T E R II.

*Of the Generation of the Son from the Father.*

## S E C T I O N I.

*The Doctrine of the Platonizing Fathers concerning the Generation of the Son, as the second Person in the Trinity, stated.*

WE have seen what notions the christian Fathers entertained of the *second principle*, in what has been called *the Platonic trinity*, viz. the divine *nous*, or *logos*, which properly signifies the divine *mind*, *reason*, or *wisdom*; that power by means of which God produced the visible world. This they considered as a real person, a *second God*, the son of the first God. There is much indistinctness and confusion in the doctrine of the Platonists themselves on this subject; but all this confusion presently vanished in the eyes of the christian Fathers; who, seeing how excellently that hypothesis was calculated to answer their purpose

purpose of exalting the personal dignity of their master, did not hesitate to maintain that this second principle, the attribute, and the only effective and operative attribute, of the Divine Being, was that which actuated Jesus Christ, and might be said to be Christ.

To complete this scheme, it was necessary that this operative principle in the Deity, should assume proper *substantial personality*, because Jesus Christ always remained a proper *person*, as much as any other intelligent being, and is always to continue so. And they were much assisted in doing this, by the principles of Philo, which have been explained above, viz. that the divine logos could assume *occasional personality*, to answer particular purposes, and then be reformed into the Divine Being again. For the thing itself being admitted to be *possible for a time*, there was no great difficulty in supposing, farther, that what had been temporary, might be perpetual; and therefore, that the logos, having been occasionally emitted from the divine mind, and having had a proper power, and a proper sphere of action to  
itself,

itself, might for ever remain possessed of them, and be for ever attached to a real man, as it had been supposed to have been attached to what had the appearance of a man, and even to have eaten and drank like a man, in the intercourse with Abraham and the patriarchs.

But the doctrine of the *occasional emission* of this divine principle preceded that of the permanent personality among christians, and continued to be held by many persons after the latter came to be the received opinion. The first mention of this idea occurs in the writings of Justin Martyr, who is likewise the first that can be proved to have adopted the doctrine of the permanent personality of the logos. He mentions it as an opinion which he did not approve; but it is remarkable, that he mentions it without any particular censure, so that it could not have been considered as an heretical doctrine.

The opinion that is described by Justin Martyr, was the same that was held by Marcellus of Ancyra, and other learned christians, who were properly enough

ranked among unitarians. For, according to them the *logos* was nothing more than a *divine power*, voluntarily emitted by the Supreme Being; and though in some sense detached from himself, was entirely dependent upon him, and taken into himself again at pleasure, when the purpose of its emission had been answered. On this scheme, the *logos*, it might have been said, would have been a person at the creation of the world, and again when it was employed in the divine intercourse with the patriarchs, in the intervals of which it was deprived of its personality, and that it recovered it again at the baptism of Christ; then, after assisting him to perform those things to which human power was unequal, was reabsorbed into the Divine Being again; just as a ray of light was, in those days, supposed to be drawn back into the sun, as the fountain of light, from which it had been emitted. This doctrine, therefore, may be called *Philosophical Unitarianism*, of which a farther account will be given hereafter. At present I only consider it as a step towards the doctrine of *permanent personality*, which

which probably commenced with Justin Martyr, and what might contribute to render it more plausible.

This doctrine would certainly appear less alarming to men of plain understanding; for it could not be said that, upon this principle, any *new being*, was introduced. For a mere *power*, occasionally emitted, and then taken back again into its source, could not come under that description. Accordingly, it appears that Marcellus, who held that opinion, was considered as an unitarian, and was popular among the lower people, who continued to be unitarians; whereas they took the greatest alarm at the doctrine of the permanent personality of the *logos*, considering it as the introduction of *another God*, and therefore, as an infringement of the first and greatest commandment.

It was to avoid this great difficulty that the christian Fathers held so obstinately as they did to the doctrine of Christ being nothing more than the *logos*, or the proper *reason*, *wisdom*, or *power* of the Father, though it contributed exceedingly to embarrass



barrafs their scheme. The Platonists had no difficulty at all on this account, as they had no measures to keep with unitarians, but rather wished to stand well with those who held a multiplicity of gods. They, therefore, never pretended that their *three principles* were *one*, or resolvable into one. This is observed by Austin and others. But the christian Fathers were not so much at liberty. They were under a necessity of maintaining the *unity of God* in some sense or other, at all events, that being the fundamental principle of their religion, and a principle that was most strictly adhered to by the common people.

On this account we find them particularly careful, on all occasions, to assert that, though they considered Christ as God, it was not as *another God*, distinct from the Father, but only the *logos*, or *reason*, of the Father himself; and, therefore, strictly speaking, one with him, as much as the reason of any man was the same thing with the man himself. On this account, also, those who called themselves *orthodox*, were so ready to charge the Arians with holding

the doctrine of *two Gods* ; because the *logos* of the Arians was a being created out of nothing, and had a different origin from the God that made him ; whereas their *logos* had always existed as *the reason of the eternal Father*, and therefore they thought themselves well secured against any retort of the same accusation from others.

Being thus obliged to keep clear of the doctrine of *two Gods*, they were under a necessity of maintaining that the *logos* was nothing more than the reason, or *operative faculty* of the Father ; at the same time that they maintained that it was a distinct person from him, which is a doctrine so manifestly absurd, that at this day it requires the plainest evidence of its having been entertained at all. However, the dread of introducing *two Gods* and the accusations of their adversaries, especially of the common people, for whom they could not but have great respect, gave them such abundant occasion to explain their real principles, and so much of their writings on this subject are still extant, that we cannot misunderstand their meaning.

It

It is not possible either by the use of plain words, or of figurative language, to express this most absurd notion, viz. that the *logos*, or the *son*, which was afterwards a *real person*, was originally nothing more than a mere *attribute of the father*, more clearly than they do. For, according to the most definite language that men can use, the *logos*, as existing in the Father, and prior to the creation, was in the opinion of those christian Fathers (who, in their own age, and even till long after the council of Nice, were considered as orthodox) the same thing in him as reason is in man, which is certainly no proper *person*, distinguishable from the man himself. Will common sense permit us to say, that the *man* is one person, or thing, and his *reason* another, not comprehended in the *man*? In like manner, it is impossible not to infer from the uniform language of the early christian writers that, according to their ideas, there was originally nothing in, or belonging to the *Son*, but what was necessarily contained in the *Father*.

Passages without end may also be selected from the most approved of the Fathers to

shew, in the clearest manner, that as the divinity which they then ascribed to Christ was the very same principle which had constituted the *wisdom*, and other *operative powers*, of God the Father, so what they called the *generation of the Son*, was the commencement of a state of actual personality in the logos; whether in time, as was thought by some, or from all eternity, as was held by others; an opinion which was afterwards received as the established doctrine on the subject.

I shall not produce a tenth part of the authorities that might easily have been selected to prove these propositions; nor one half of those which I have actually collected for the purpose; but they will be abundantly sufficient to put an end to all the doubts that can have been entertained on the subject, especially as they will be extracted from writers of the most unquestioned orthodoxy, from Justin Martyr, to those of a very late period in the christian history.

## SECTION II.

*Authorities for this Opinion from Justin  
Martyr to Origen.*

FROM a careful perusal of the writings of Justin, I cannot help thinking that he was the first, or one of the first, who advanced the doctrine of the permanent personality of the *logos*. He seems to write as if this was the case; and it is also certain, that he was the oldest of the authorities for the pre-existence of Christ quoted by the anonymous author in Eusebius, as will be shewn hereafter. Justin says, “Jesus Christ “is the only proper son of God, being his “*logos*, first born, and powerful \*.” Had he meant any other principle than the very *logos* which was an attribute of the Father, he would have said *a logos*, or *the logos*, and not *his logos*. But I quote this passage not as the most explicit, but as the first in the

\* Καὶ Ἰησὺς χριστὸς μόνος ἰδίως υἱὸς τῷ θεῷ γεγεννημένος λόγος αὐτοῦ  
υπαρχῶν, καὶ παλαιότατος, καὶ δυναμὶς. Apol. i. p. 35.

writings of Justin in which this sentiment appears. He likewise says, “ Moses informs us that the spirit, and a power which was from God, is no other than the logos who was the first begotten of God\*.” Some other characters which Justin imagined the logos to assume are mentioned in the following passage. “ The logos of God is also called his Son. He is likewise called an angel, and an apostle, or one sent by another,” quoting the words of our Saviour, “ He that heareth me heareth him that sent me†.”

But the following larger extract from Justin shews most distinctly that, in his idea, the logos of God bore the same relation to God, that the logos, or reason, of man bears to man, and that this principle was, in his opinion, the medium of all the divine communications from God to man

\* Το πνευμα εν κ' την δυνμιν την παρα τε θεσ ἔδεν αλλο νοησαι θεμις, η τον λογον, ος κ' πρωτοκ' τω θεω εστι, Μωυσης ο προδεδηλωμεν' προφητης εμνηυσε. Apol. i. p. 54.

† Ο λογ' δε τε θεσ εστιν ο υιος αυτε, ως προεφημεν. κ' αγγελ' δε καλειται, κ' αποσολ'. αυλος γαρ απαγγελλει οσα δει γνωσθηναι, κ' αποσελλεται μηνυων οσα αγγελλειται, ως κ' αυ' ο κυριος ημων ειπεν, ο εμσ ακρων ακρει τε αποσειλαν' με. Ibid. p. 93.

from

from the beginning of the world. “ I will  
“ shew you from the scriptures, that in the  
“ beginning, before all creatures, God pro-  
“ duced from himself a rational power,  
“ which is called by the holy spirit, the  
“ glory of God, sometimes the Son, some-  
“ times wisdom, sometimes an angel, some-  
“ times God, sometimes Lord, and logos.  
“ Sometimes he calls himself *commander in*  
“ *chief*, having appeared in the form of a  
“ man to Joshua. He has these names  
“ from his being subservient to his Father’s  
“ will, and from being produced at his Fa-  
“ ther’s pleasure, such as we experience  
“ in ourselves. For, on our uttering any  
“ word (i. e. logos) we generate a logos,  
“ not that any thing is cut off from us so  
“ that we are diminished by that means,  
“ but as we see one fire lighted by another,  
“ that not being diminished from which  
“ it was lighted, but continuing the same.  
“ In proof of this, I can produce the word  
“ of wisdom, shewing that he is a God pro-  
“ duced from the Father of all, being the  
“ logos, the wisdom, the power, and the  
“ glory of him that generated him; and

“ Solomon says, if I tell you what happens  
 “ to day, I will recount things from the  
 “ beginning. The Lord created me the  
 “ αρχη,” the beginning, “ the way to his  
 “ works. Before the angels he established  
 “ me, in the beginning, before he made the  
 “ earth\*.”

Here is the whole system of Justin, and of the Fathers before the council of Nice, and also the chief foundation on which it

\* Μαρτυρεῖν δὲ καὶ ἄλλο ὑμῖν ὦ φίλοι, εἶπεν, ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν ὧστω, οἱ ἀρχὴν πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων ὁ θεὸς γεγενῆκε δύναμιν τινα ἐξ αὐτοῦ λογικὴν, ἥτις καὶ δοξάει κυρίῃ ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ἀγίας καλεῖσθαι, ὥστε δὲ υἱός, ὥστε δὲ σοφία, ὥστε δὲ ἀγγελός, ὥστε δὲ θεός, ὥστε δὲ κύριος, καὶ λογός. Ὅτε δὲ ἀρχιτεράστιον αὐτὸν λέγει, ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ μορφῇ φανεῖσθαι τῷ τῷ Ναυη Ἰησοῦ. ἔχειν γὰρ πάντα προσονομαζέσθαι ἐκ τοῦ τοῦ ὑπηρετεῖν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ βελημάτι, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς θελητεῖ γεγενῆσθαι, [ἀλλ' εἰ] τοιούτων ὅποιον καὶ ἐφ' ἡμῶν γενομένου ὁρώμεν. Λόγον γὰρ τινα προβαλλόντες, λόγον γενώμεν, καὶ κατὰ ἀπόδομιν ὡς ἐλαττωθῆναι τὸν ἐν ἡμῖν λόγον προβαλλομενοί. Καὶ ὅποιον ἐπὶ πυρός ὁρώμεν ἄλλο, γινόμενον, ἐκ ἐλαττωμένου ἐκείνου ἐξ ἧς ἀναψίς γεγενῆκεν, ἀλλὰ τὰ αὐτὴ μενούσθαι. Καὶ τὸ ἐξ αὐτῆ ἀναφθὴν καὶ αὐτὸ οὐ φαίνεται, ἐκ ἐλαττώσαντος ἐκείνου ἐξ ἧς ἀνηφθῆ. μαρτυρεῖται δὲ μοι ὁ λόγος τῆς σοφίας, αὐτὸς ὡς οὐκ ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὁλῶν γεννηθείς, καὶ λόγος, καὶ σοφία, καὶ δύναμις, καὶ δοξά τῶν γεννησαυτὸς ὑπαρχῶν, καὶ διὰ Σολομῶντος φησαμένῃ ταῦτα, εἰαν ἀναγγείλω ὑμῖν τὰ καθ' ἡμέραν γινόμενα, μνημονεύσω τὰ ἐξ αἰῶνος ἀριθμηταί. Κύριε ἐκίσσε με ἀρχὴν. ὁδὸν αὐτῆς εἰς τὰ ἔργα αὐτῆς. Πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐθεμελίωσε με. Ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸ τοῦ τὴν γῆν ποιῆσαι. Dial. p. 266.

N. B. Αλλ' εἰ, line 7. as Thirlby observes, must be a corruption, or interpolation.



was built. This, however, I shall not stop to examine, but proceed to state the opinions of other christian writers who followed Justin. Irenæus expresses the same thought more concisely, when he says, “ God is wholly mind, and existing logos, “ what he thinks, that he speaks. His “ thought is the logos, and logos is *mind*; “ and the mind comprehending every thing “ is the Father himself\*.”

In the following passage of Theophilus we see more clearly than in the preceding of Irenæus, that the logos was considered as being the same thing with the proper wisdom of the Father. “ When he said, *let us* “ *make man*, he spake to nothing but his “ own logos, and his own wisdom†.” If the opinion of Theophilus had not been certainly known, it might even have been questioned whether, in writing the above passage, he really considered the logos as a

\* Deus autem totus existens mens, et totus existens logos, quod cogitat, hoc et loquitur; et quod loquitur, hoc et cogitat. Cogitatio enim ejus logos, et logos mens, et omnia concludens mens, ipse est pater. Lib. 2. cap. 48. p. 176.

† Ουκ αλλω δε τινη ειρηκε, ποιησωμεν, αλλ’ η τω εαυτη λογω, κ’ τη εαυτη σοφια. Lib. 2. p. 114.

*person;*

person; and indeed it is very possible that, without attending to it, he might revert to the original meaning of the word *logos*, expressing himself as an unitarian would have done. But the following passage puts it out of all doubt that this writer considered the *logos* as a real person, but originally nothing more than an attribute of the Father. Speaking of the voice which Adam heard in Paradise, he says, “What is it but  
 “ the *logos* of God, which is also his Son,  
 “ but not as the poets and mythologists  
 “ think of sons of God produced by copu-  
 “ lation, but really considering the *logos* as  
 “ being at all times in the heart of God;  
 “ for before any thing was made he had  
 “ him for his counsellor, being his own  
 “ mind and understanding. Wherefore  
 “ when God chose to make what he had  
 “ devised, he generated his *logos*, then put  
 “ forth the first begotten of all creation,  
 “ not depriving himself of *logos*, but gene-  
 “ rating *logos*, and always conversing with  
 “ his own *logos* \*.”

\* Πρωτὴ δὲ τι ἄλλο ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἢ ὁ λόγος ὁ τῆ θεοῦ, ὃς ἐστὶ καὶ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ.  
 καὶ ὡς οἱ ποιηταὶ καὶ μυθολογοῦντες λέγουσι υἱὸς θεοῦ ἐκ συνουσίας γεννημένους,

Athenagoras is not less explicit than Theophilus. He says, “ If I were asked  
 “ what the Son of God is, I should say that  
 “ he is the first production of the Father,  
 “ not as *made*, for God being an eternal  
 “ mind, has *logos* always in himself, being  
 “ from eternity a rational being, but as  
 “ going forth, to be the *idea*, and *energy*, to  
 “ material things of all kinds, which are  
 “ naturally subject to controul ; the heavy  
 “ and the light being mixed together ;” i. e.  
 being in a state of chaos. Here is the precise  
 language of Platonism, in which *idea* was  
 synonymous to *nous*, which the christians  
 called *logos*. He adds, that “ the prophetic  
 “ spirit confirms this, when he said, The  
 “ Lord created me the *αρχη* [the principle]  
 “ with respect to his works \* ;” meaning,

αλλα ως αληθεια διηγεῖται τον λογον, τον οντα διαπαντος ενδιαθειον εν  
 καρδια θεῷ. προ γαρ τι γινεσθαι τειλον ειχε συμβεβηκον εαυτῳ νεν, κῃ φρο-  
 νησιν οντα. οποτε δε ηδελησεν ο θεος ποιησαι οσα εβελευσαιο, τειλον τον  
 λογον εγεννησε προφορικον, πρωτοστοικον πασης κτισεως, & κενωθεις αυτος τε  
 λογη, αλλα λογον γεννησας, κῃ τω λογω αυτῳ διαπαντος ομιλων. Lib. 2.  
 p. 129.

\* Οπως τι βεβαιαι, ερω δια βραχεων. πρωτον γεννημα ειναι τω πατρι,  
 οχ ως γενομενον (εξ αρχης γαρ ο θεος, νεν αιδιος ων, ειχεν αυτος εν εαυτω  
 τον λογον, αιδιως λογικος ων) αλλ ως των υλικων ξυμπαντων οποιε φυσεως  
 κῃ γης,

that the Son, when produced, was the source from which other things were made.

In this passage, as the writer explains what he meant by *God having always had the logos in himself*, by saying, that he was always λογικόν, that is, a *rational intelligent being*, he certainly meant to intimate, that before the generation of the logos, it was the very same principle in God, that *reason* is in man, being his proper *wisdom*, or *intelligence*, one of his attributes ; and it was never imagined, that there were proper distinct persons in the mind of man, merely because man is λογικόν, *rational*. The very expression excludes the idea, and must have been intended to exclude it.

Clemens Alexandrinus has been thought by some to favour the Arian principle, of the *logos* being a *creature, made out of nothing* ; but it will appear by the following passages, that nothing could be farther from

ἐξ ἧς οὐκ ἔστιν ὑποκείμενον δίκην, μεμιγμένων τῶν παχυμερεστέρων πρὸς τα κρυφώτερα ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, ἰδέα καὶ ἐνεργεία εἶναι προελθῶν. συναδελφείῃ δὲ τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τῷ προφητικῷ πνεύματι, Κυρίῳ γὰρ, φησὶν, ἐκίσε με, ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτῆς εἰς ἐργα αὐτῆς. Apol. p. 82.

his real ideas than that opinion, though the language in which he sometimes expresses the generation of the Son from the Father may be capable of that construction. Speaking of the *logos*, he says, “ He is the wisdom in which the Almighty delighted : “ for the Son is the power of God, as he is “ the most ancient *logos* of the Father, before all things that were made, and his “ wisdom, and especially the chosen teacher “ of those who were made by him \*.”— “ God cannot be shewn, nor can he teach ; “ but the Son is wisdom, and knowledge, “ and truth, and every thing of this kind†.”

Of all the christian writers of antiquity, none exceeded Tertullian in the confidence which he had in his own principles. He seems to have imagined that there was no

\* Αγνωία γαρ εχ' απήλθαι τε θεε, τε προ καλαθελης κοσμου συμβεβηκε γενομενε τε παίρος . αυτη γαρ ην σοφια η προσεχαιρεν ο παντοκρατωρ θεος . δυναμις γαρ τε θεε ο υιος, ατε προ πασι των γενομενων αρχικω-  
τατος λογος τε παίρος . κ' σοφια αυτη \* κυριως αν κ' διδασκαλος λεχθειη των δι αυτη πλάσθειων. Strom. lib. 7. p. 703.

† Ο μεν εν θεος, αναποδεικτος ων, εκ ειν επισημόνικος, ο δε δε υιος, σοφια τε εστι κ' επισημη, αληθεια, κ' οσα αλλα τεω συγλην. Ibid. lib. 4. p. 537.

difficulty

difficulty whatever in comprehending them; and therefore he did not fear to enter into all the minutiae of them, in order to answer every possible objection, or cavil. By this means we are in full possession of his thoughts, as much as if we could now interrogate him on the subject; and as his orthodoxy with respect to the doctrine of the trinity was never questioned in his own age, we see very clearly what that orthodoxy was. Among a number of passages that I might have selected from him for my present purpose, the following, I imagine, will be quite sufficient.

“ Before all things, God was alone. He  
“ was a world and place, and all things to  
“ himself. He was alone, because there  
“ was nothing foreign to himself. But  
“ then he was not absolutely alone, for he  
“ had with him, and in him, his own *rea-*  
“ *son*; for God is a rational being. This  
“ the Greeks called *logos*, which word we  
“ translate *sermo* [speech] and therefore, we,  
“ through simplicity, are accustomed to  
“ say that *sermo* was from the beginning  
“ with

“ with God, when we ought to have pre-  
“ ferred the word *ratio* [reason] because  
“ God was from the beginning *rationalis*  
“ [a being endued with reason] not *ser-*  
“ *monalis* [endued with speech] and because  
“ speech, consisting with reason, has it as  
“ its substance. This, however, makes no  
“ difference. For though God had not  
“ yet emitted his word, he had it with-  
“ in himself, together with his reason,  
“ and in his reason, silently thinking and  
“ contriving within himself what he was  
“ about to pronounce by his speech. For  
“ thinking, and disposing with his reason,  
“ he made that *speech*, which he treated with  
“ speech. That you may the more easily  
“ understand this from yourself, consider,  
“ as you are made in the image and after  
“ the likeness of God, the reason which  
“ you have in yourself, who are a rational  
“ creature, not only made by a rational ar-  
“ tificer, but animated by his substance.  
“ Consider that when you silently muse  
“ with yourself, reason is acting within  
“ you, that principle concurring with  
“ speech

“ speech to every thought and sensation.  
 “ Whatever you think is *sermo* [speech]  
 “ and whatever you perceive is *ratio* [reason]  
 “ —. How much more doth this take  
 “ place in the mind of God, of whom you  
 “ are the image and likeness, that he has  
 “ in himself when he is silent, *reason*, and  
 “ in reason *speech*. I may, therefore, ven-  
 “ ture to assert, that God, before the con-  
 “ stitution of the universe, was not alone ;  
 “ as he had then reason within himself,  
 “ and in reason speech, which he could  
 “ make a second principle from himself,  
 “ by acting within himself\*.”

\* Ante omnia enim Deus erat solus, ipse sibi et mun-  
 dus, et locus, et omnia. Solus autem, quia nihil aliud ex-  
 trinsecus præter illum. Ceterum, ne tunc quidem solus ;  
 habebat enim secum, quam habebat in semetipso ; ra-  
 tionem suam scilicet. Rationalis etiam Deus, et ratio in  
 ipso prius ; et ita ab ipso omnia. Quæ ratio, sensus ipsius  
 est. Hanc Græci *λογον* dicunt, quo vocabulo etiam ser-  
 monem appellamus. Ideoque jam in usu est nostrorum,  
 per simplicitatem interpretationis, sermonem dicere in pri-  
 mordio, apud Deum fuisse ; cum magis rationem com-  
 petat antiquiorem haberi ; quia non sermonalis a principio,  
 sed rationalis Deus etiam ante principium ; et quia ipse  
 quoque sermo ratione consistens, priorem eam, ut substan-  
 tiam



This passage needs no comment. At least what I have observed with respect to the quotation from Athenagoras will be quite sufficient for it, the λογικὸς of the Greek writer being the same thing with the *rationalis* of the Latin author. I shall only

tiam suam ostendat. Tamen et sic nihil interest. Nam etsi Deus nondum sermonem suum miserat, proinde eum cum ipsa et in ipsa ratione intra semetipsum habebat, tacite cogitando et disponendo secum, quæ per sermonem mox erat dicturus. Cum ratione enim sua cogitans atque disponens, sermonem eam efficiebat, quam sermone tractabat. Idque quo facilius intelligas ex te ipso, ante recognosce ut ex imagine et similitudine Dei, quam habeas et tu in temet ipso rationem, qui es animal rationale, a rationali scilicet artifice non tantum factus, sed etiam ex substantia ipsius animatus. Vide quum tacitus tecum ipse congregeris, ratione hoc ipsum agi intra te, occurrente ea tibi cum sermone ad omnem cogitatus tui motum, et ad omnem sensus tui pulsum. Quodcumque cogitaveris, sermo est; quodcumque senseris, ratio est.—Quanto ergo plenius hoc agitur in Deo, cujus tu quoque imago et similitudo censeris, quod habeat in se etiam tacendo rationem, et in ratione sermonem? Possum itaque non temere præstruxisse, et tunc Deum ante universitatis constitutionem solum non fuisse, habentem in semetipso proinde rationem, et in ratione sermonem, quem secundum a se faceret, agitando intra se. Ad Praxeam, sect. 5. Opera, p. 503.

give two other extracts from this writer, which clearly shew what, in his idea, was the true origin of what is called the *second principle* in the trinity. “Christ,” he says, “is the power of God, and the spirit of God, the speech, the wisdom, the reason, and the Son of God\*.”

That, in the opinion of Tertullian, it was Christ who was the immediate maker of the world, cannot be questioned, and yet in the following passage the power by which it was made, is described as the proper inherent power of God the Father. “You see how by the operation of God all things consist, in the power of making the earth, the wisdom of preparing the world, and the understanding of extending the heavens; not appearing only, nor approaching, but exerting such force of his mind, wisdom, power, understanding, word, spirit, power†.”

\* Ut Dei virtus, et Dei spiritus, et sermo, et sapientia, et ratio, et Dei filius. Apol. sect. 23. Opera, p. 23.

† Vides ergo quemadmodum operatione Dei universa consistunt, valentia facientis terram, intelligentia parantis orbem,

Cyprian, who usually called Tertullian his master, follows him in expressing exactly the same ideas. “Christ,” he says, “is the power of God, his reason, his wisdom, and glory. He, descending into the virgin’s womb, put on flesh by the aid of the Holy Spirit. He is God mixed with man. He is our God, and Christ, who being the mediator of the two, put on man to bring him to the Father\*.”

orbem, et sensu extendentis cœlum: non adparentis solummodo, nec adpropinquantis, sed adhibentis tantos animi sui nissus, sophiam, valentiam, sensum, sermonem, spiritum, virtutem. Ad Hermogenem, sect. 45. Opera, p. 249.

\* Hujus igitur indulgentiæ, gratiæ disciplinæque arbiter et magister, sermo et filius Dei mittitur, qui per prophetas omnes retro, illuminator et doctor humani generis prædicabatur. Hic est virtus Dei, hic ratio, hic sapientia ejus, et gloria. Hic in virginem illabatur; carnem, spiritu sancto co-operante, induitur. Deus cum homine miscetur. Hic Deus noster, hic Christus est, qui mediator duorum, hominem induit, quem perducatur ad patrem. De Idolorum Vanitate, Opera, p. 15;

## SECTION III.

*Authorities from Origen, and other Writers subsequent to him; with an Account of other Attributes of the Father, besides that of Wisdom, which Christ is said to have been.*

**O**RIGEN, as well as Clemens Alexandrinus, has been thought to favour the Arian principle; but he did it only in words, and not in ideas, as will be evident from the following passages; and many more to the same purpose might have been extracted from his writings. “ Though we speak,” he says, “ of a *second* “ *God*, we mean nothing more than a vir- “ tue comprehending all virtues, and a “ reason comprehending all reason, for the “ good of the whole, which we say is “ united to the soul of Jesus; which we “ say was alone capable of partaking of “ this perfect reason, perfect wisdom, and “ perfect virtue\*.” “ God, according to

\* Καν δευτερον εν λεγωμεν θεον • ιωσαν οτι τον δευτερον θεον εκ  
αλλο τι λεγωμεν, η την περιεκλικην παστων αρεων αρεην, η τον περι-  
εκλικον

“ us, can do nothing without his logos,  
 “ or without himself\*.” “ All that are  
 “ God’s are in Christ. He is the power of  
 “ God, he is the righteousness of God, he  
 “ is sanctification, he is redemption, he is  
 “ the mind of God†.” “ He is *εμφυχῶς*  
 “ *σοφία* ‡.” [*living wisdom*] An expression  
 similar to this is used in the creed ascribed  
 to Gregory Thaumaturgus, who was a dis-  
 ciple of Origen. The creed, however, by  
 the credulous superstition of the age, was  
 said to come from the apostle John. There  
 the Son of God is called *σοφία υφ’ ἑωσα*, sub-  
 stantial wisdom ||.

*ἐκλικον πάντως ἔλινουσεν λογὴ των κατὰ φύσιν καὶ προηγῆμενως γεγεννημένων  
 καὶ εἰς χρησιμον τὴ πάντως, λόγον. οὐτινα τῇ Ἰησὺ μαλιστα παρὰ πα-  
 σαν ψυχὴν ψυχὴ ὠκειωσθαι καὶ ἠνωσθαι φαμεν, μόνε τελείως χωρηταὶ  
 δεδυνημενς τὴν ἀκρὰν μέλοχην τὴ αὐτολογίᾳ, καὶ τῆς αὐτοσοφίας, καὶ τῆς  
 αὐτοδιδασκαλίας.* Ad Celsum, lib. 5. p. 258.

\* Ἀλλὰ, καὶ καθ’ ἡμᾶς, ἔδεν ὁ ἰοῦσε παρὰ λόγον, εἴτε παρ’ αὐτὸν,  
*ἐργασασθαι εἶναι ὁ θεός.* Ibid. p. 247.

† Πάντα γὰρ ὅσα τὰ θεὸς τοιαῦτα, ἐν αὐτῷ εἶναι· χρῆτος ἐστὶ σοφία  
 τὰ θεὸς, αὐτὸς δυνάμις θεὸς, αὐτὸς δικαιοσύνη θεῶν, αὐτὸς ἀγιασμός, αὐτὸς  
 ἀπολυτῶσις, αὐτὸς φρονήσις ἐστὶ θεὸς. In Jer. Hom. 8. Com-  
 ment. vol. 1. p. 96.

‡ In Johan. Comment. vol. 2. p. 19.

|| Gr. Thaum. Opera. p. 11.



“ actually generated he was virtually in the  
 “ Father ungenerated\*.”

Athanasius, whose orthodoxy will hardly be called in question, held exactly the same language with Athenagoras and Tertullian; and yet he does not express the opinion of the *logos* having been the proper reason of the Father more definitely than Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, or Eusebius.

“ The Father of Christ,” he says, “ as  
 “ the best governor, by his own wisdom,  
 “ and his own *logos*, our Lord Jesus Christ,  
 “ governs every where happily, and orders  
 “ as he thinks proper†.” He says of Christ, that “ he is the proper wisdom, the  
 “ proper *logos*, and the proper power of the  
 “ Father‡.”

Again, speaking of the *logos* of God, he says, “ it is not like the *logos* of a rational  
 “ creature, composed of syllables, and ut-

\* Επει κ' πριν ενεργεια γεννηθηναι, δυναμει ην εν τω πατρι αγεννη-  
 τως. Theodoriti Hist. lib. 1. cap 12. p. 40.

† Ο τ' ε χρις πατηρ, οστις καθαπερ αριστος κυβερνητης τη ιδια σοφια,  
 κ' τω ιδιω λογω, τω κυριω ημων Ιησε χριτω, τα παντα κε κυβερνα σωτηριας  
 κ' διακοσμει, κ' ποιει ως αν αυτω καλως εχειν δοκη. Contra Gentes,  
 Opera, vol. 1. p. 44.

‡ Αλλ' αυλοσοφια, αυλογος, αυλοδυναμης ιδια τ' ε πατρος εστιν. Ibid.  
 p. 51.

“tered in air, but the living and efficacious  
 “God, of the good God of all, I mean rea-  
 “son itself, which is different from all  
 “things which are made (*γεννησων*) and from  
 “the whole creation. It is the peculiar  
 “and only logos of the good Father, which  
 “arranged the whole system, and illumi-  
 “nates it by his providence\*.”

The same language continued to be held by the most distinguished champions of orthodoxy after the time of Athanasius. Gregory Nyssen says, “The Father does nothing without the Son, nor the Son without the Father, of which we have an example in ourselves, for the soul does nothing without reason, nor reason without the soul †.”

\* Ουδε οιον εχει το λογικον γενοσ λογον, τον εκ συλλαβων συγκειμενον, κ' εν αεφι σημαινουμενον, αλλα τον τε αγαθε κ' θεσ των ολων ζωνται και ενεργη θεον, αυτολογον λεγω, οσ αλλος μεν εσι των γεννητων και πασης της κτισεως. ιδιος δε και μονος τε αγαθε πατροσ υπαρχει λογος, οσ τοδε το παν διεκοσμησε και φωλιζει τε τη εαυτε προνοια. *Contra Gentes*, Opera, vol. I. p. 44.

† Ουδε γαρ ο υιος διχα πατροσ, αφ' εαυτε καθ' εαυτον, ποιει τι, ουδε ο πατηρ παντως χωρισ τε υις κ' τε πνευματοσ—Και οφει μιαν κ' ομοιαν την ενεργειαν εν ημιν. Ουτε γαρ η ψυχη διχα λογε επιλει τι, ετε ο λογος διχα ψυχης, ετε μην ο νεσ παλιν καθ' εαυτον, χωρισ της ψυχης κ' τε λογε κατεργαζεται τι. *In Gen. i. 26*. Opera, vol. I. p. 865.



“ If the Son, as the scripture says, be  
 “ the power of God, wisdom, and truth,  
 “ and light, and sanctification, and peace,  
 “ and life, and the like, according to the  
 “ doctrine of the heretics” (meaning the  
 Arians) “ these things were not before the  
 “ Son; and these having no existence, the  
 “ Father himself must have been divested  
 “ of all these advantages \*.” With the  
 same idea, Ambrose says, “ Could the Fa-  
 “ ther ever be without life, without wis-  
 “ dom, without power, without reason,  
 “ which Christ is †.” “ He is, therefore,”  
 he says, “ called the wisdom of God, as the  
 “ Father can never be thought to be with-  
 “ out wisdom, that is, without his Son.  
 “ This is that ineffable wisdom, which is  
 “ described by Solomon as the *beginning of*  
 “ *the ways of God*, whether it be founded,

\* Εἰ γὰρ ὁ υἱός, καθὼς ἡ γράφη λέγει, δύναμις ἐστὶ θεὸς, καὶ σοφία, καὶ ἀληθεία, καὶ φῶς, καὶ ἁγιασμός, καὶ εἰρήνη, καὶ ζῶη, καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα· ποῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ εἶναι, καθὼς τοῖς αἱρετικοῖς δοκεῖ, εἶδε ταῦτα ἡν παντός· ταῦτα δὲ μὴ ὄντων, κενὸν παντός των τοιούτων αγαθῶν τον πατρῶων ἐννοήσας· κολπον. Contra Eunomium, Opera, vol. 2. p. 4.

† Num quidnam potuit esse tempus quando pater sine vita, sine sapientia, sine virtute, sine verbo, quod Christus est, fuerit? In Symbol. Opera, vol. 4. p. 88.

“ or

“ or generated, or created ; which, how-  
 “ ever, is so founded, as that it is always  
 “ with God \*.”

This continued to be the language of the orthodox divines till a very late period. Damascenus says, “ God has no other lo-  
 “ gos, wisdom, power, or will, but the  
 “ Son †.” Theophylact also says, “ God  
 “ could not be without reason, wisdom, or  
 “ power ; wherefore we believe, that since  
 “ the Son is the reason, the wisdom, and  
 “ the power of the Father, he is always  
 “ (προς) with God, instead of συν, or μετὰ ‡.”

If these passages do not give my readers perfect satisfaction with respect to the real

\* Et ideo sapientia Dei appellatur, ut nunquam pater sine sapientia, hoc est sine filio suo fuisse credatur. Hæc est illa sapientia ineffabilis, quæ initium viarum Dei apud Salomonem, vel condita, vel genita, vel creata describitur, quam tamen sic conditam dicit, ut semper eam cum Deo fuisse constet. De Filii Divinitate, Opera, vol. 4. p. 278.

† Καὶ γὰρ φησὶν ὁ Δαμασκηνὸς ἐν τοῖς θεολογικοῖς αὐτοῦ κεφαλαίοις. Ἰνα μὴ πολλὰ λέγω, ἐκ ἐστὶ τῷ πατρὶ λόγος, σοφία, δυναμὶς, θελήσις, εἰ μὴ οὐκ εἶμι. Manuel Caleca, in Combefis, vol. 2. p. 222.

‡ Οὐκ ἐνδεχέσθαι γὰρ τὸν θεὸν ἀλογὸν ἢ ἀσοφὸν εἶναι ὥστε, ἢ ἀδυνατῶν· διὰ ταῦτο πιστεύομεν, ὅτι ἐπεὶ λόγος, καὶ σοφία, καὶ δυναμὶς τῷ πατρὶ εἰναι οὐκ εἶμι, αἰνὴν ἢ πρὸς θεόν, αὐτὴν τὴν συν τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ μετὰ τῷ πατρὶ. In John, Opera, vol. 1. p. 556.

origin

origin of the *logos* of the orthodox Fathers, and convince them, that by the *logos* they understood a proper *attribute of the Father*, and that this attribute became the person of the Son, and was afterwards united to Jesus Christ, most absurd as the notion certainly is, I shall despair of being able to prove any thing.

Origen was so fully persuaded of the *logos* that was in Christ being the true *logos*, or power of the Father, that he represents it as omnipotent, and not confined to the person of Christ. “ The Evangelists,” says he, “ do not represent the *logos* as circumscribed within the body and soul of Jesus, as is evident from many considerations. Thus, John the Baptist, prophesying that the Son of God would soon make his appearance, says, not that he would be in that body, and in that soul, but every where ; for, he says, he standeth in the midst of you, whom you know not \*.”

\* Ουδε τα ευαγγελια οιδε περιγεγραμμενον τιναι γεγονεναι, ως εδωκεν εξω της ψυχης η τε σωματος τε Ιησους τυλχανουσι. Διχον μιν η απο πολλων, η εξ ολιγων δε, αν παραδησομεθα, εως εχοντων. ο βικτωριος Ιωαννης

He even considers this *logos* as imparted to other men in certain degrees, as if all *reason* was a portion of the same eternal *logos*. Descanting on John, chap. i. 9. *he enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world*, he says, “Whoever is endued with “reason (λογικῶ) partakes of the true light. “But every man is endued with reason; “all men, therefore, have the *logos*. In “some the power of the *logos* is great, but “in some it is little. If you see a soul “given to passion, and sinful, you see the “power of the *logos* failing; but if you “see a soul holy and righteous, you see the “power of the *logos* bringing forth fruit “daily\*.” This very much resembles the language of the Quakers, who speak of

Ἰωάννης προφήτευον ὅσον εὐδῆποι εὐσησεσθαι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἃν ἐν ἐκείνῳ  
 τοῦ σοματίου καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ τυλχανοῦνται, ἀλλὰ γὰρ φθανοῦνται πανταχοῦ, λέγει  
 περὶ αὐτοῦ. Μέσος ὑμῶν ἐσηκεν ἐν ὑμῖν ἃν οὐδαίε, οὐ πῖσῳ μὲ ἐρχομενΘ.  
 Ad Celsum, lib. 3. p. 63.

\* Καὶ ὅς ἐστι λογικός, μέλειχει τὰ ἀληθινὰ φῶς. λογικός δι' ἐστὶ πᾶς  
 ἀνθρώπος, τῶν ἐν μέλειχρίῳ λόγῳ πάντων ἀνθρώπων. ἐν τισὶ μὲν ἡ ἰσχύς  
 τοῦ λόγου ἠνέχθησεν, ἐν τισὶ δὲ ἐκλείπει. ἐὰν δὲ ἰδῇς ψυχὴν ἐμπαθεῖν, καὶ  
 σμαρτῶλον, οὐκ ἐκεῖ τὴν ἰσχύν τοῦ λόγου ἐπιλείπεσαν. ἐὰν δὲ ἰδῇς ψυχὴν  
 ἀγίαν καὶ δικαίαν, οὐκ ἐκεῖ τὴν ἰσχύν τοῦ λόγου σήμεραι καρποφορεσάν. In  
 Jer. Comment. vol. I. p. 138.

Christ

Christ being in all men. Origen likewise seems to have supposed that the ancient prophets might have had the *logos* so imparted to them, as that they themselves might have been called *logoi*, as well as Christ. “If Elias,” says he, “be a *logos*, “he must be a *logos* inferior to him that “was in the beginning with God \*.”

It will be seen in the preceding passages that the *logos* was considered as being more properly the *wisdom*, or *reason* of God; though, in some of them, mention is made of his being the same with other attributes of God, and especially his *power*. In the following passages this is more particularly expressed; “God, by his own omnipotence, “that is, by his Son (for all things were “made by him, and without him nothing “was made) before all things created the “heavens and the earth †.” “The energy

\* Εἰ δὲ ὁ λόγος τις ἐστὶν ὁ Ἠλίας, ὑποδεσφερός λογος τὸ ἐν ἀρχῇ παρὸς τὸν θεὸν θεὸς λογος. In Matt. Comment. vol. I. p. 307.

† Ergo Deus omnium creatur optimus, per summam suam potentiam, id est, filium suum (omnia enim per ipsum facta sunt, et sine ipso factum est nihil) cœlum terramque ante omnia creavit. Cyril. Alex: Opera, vol. I. p. 17.

“ of the Lord has respect to the Almighty ;  
 “ for the Son may be said to be the Fa-  
 “ ther’s energy \*.”

At other times the *logos*, or the Son, is represented as being the *will* of the Father. Clemens Alexandrinus calls the *logos* the will of the Father ; and under the idea of an attribute of God, as giving him to men, he represents him as addressing them in the following manner : “ I give you the *logos*,  
 “ the knowledge of God, I give my whole  
 “ self. This I am, this is what God wills,  
 “ this is symphony, this is the harmony of  
 “ the Father, this is the Son, this the  
 “ Christ, this the *logos* of God, the arm of  
 “ the Lord, almighty power, the will of the  
 “ Father †.”

Cyril of Alexandria expresses the same idea with greater precision. “ How,” says

\* Πασα δε η τε κυρια ενεργεια, επι τον παντοκρατορα την αναφοραν εχει, η εστιν, ως ειπειν, πατρικη τις ενεργεια ο υιος. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. 7. Opera, p. 703.

† Και λογον χαριζομαι υμιν, την γνωσιν τε θεου, τελειον εμαυτον χαριζομαι. Τελο ειμι εγω, τελο βασιλει ο θεος, τελο συμφωνια εστι, τελο αρμονια πατρός, τελο υιος, τελο χριστος, τελο ο λογος τε θεου, βραχιων κυριου, δυναμις των όλων, το θελημα τε πατρός. Ad Gentes, Opera, p. 75.

he,

he, “ was he” [Christ] “ made by the will  
 “ of the Father, if the will of the Father  
 “ be in him. For you must either suppose  
 “ another wisdom by which he deliberated  
 “ and made the Son, as you say” (speaking  
 to the Arians) “ or if there be no other,  
 “ but the Son alone is the wisdom of the  
 “ Father, he is also his will ; for the will  
 “ of God consists in his wisdom \*.” Gre-  
 gory Nyssen also says, “ the Son, who is in  
 “ the Father, knows the will of the Father;  
 “ but rather he is the will of the Father †.”  
 “ What,” says Victorinus, “ is the will of  
 “ the Father, but his silent word ? ‡.”

As these writers said, that though the  
 Father emitted the logos, he did not deprive

\* Quomodo igitur per voluntatem patris factus est, si in  
 eo patris voluntas est ? Nam aut alteram sapientiam fin-  
 gere necesse est, in qua deliberavit et fecit filium, ut vos  
 dicitis : aut si altera non est, sed solus filius sapientia patris  
 est, ipse quoque voluntas ejus est : in sapientia enim Dei *vells*  
 ipsius est. Thesaurus, lib. 1. cap. 8. Opera, vol. 2. p. 230.

† Ηθελησε τι ο πατηρ, κ̅̅̅ ο εν τω πατρι ων υιος, ει δε το  
 θελημα τε πατρος· μαλλον δε αυτος τε πατρος εγενετο θε-  
 λημα. Contra Eunomium, Or. 12. Opera, vol. 2. p. 345.

‡ Quid etiam est voluntas patris, nisi silens verbum ? Ad  
 Arium, lib. 3. Bib. Pat. vol. 5. p. 332.

himself

himself of *logos*, so, some of them likewise supposed, that though the Son was the will of the Father, the latter had another will, like that of man. This is particularly allowed by Manual Caleca, because “volitions,” as he says, “have a beginning and an end, whereas neither the essence of God, nor the image of God, can begin or end\*.”

Instances occur in which Christ is considered as being the very *soul* of God. Indeed, this idea may have been perceived in some of the former quotations. Eusebius says, there is “one *logos* in God, which is almighty, and which enlightens all things, as there is one soul, and one rational power in man†.”

Origen, after speaking of the soul as a middle principle between the body and

\* Λεγέται δὲ καὶ ἄλλη βεβησις ἐξω τῆς ὤψης τε θεῶν κατ’ ἀνθρώπινον ἐπιβολὴν νοεμένη — Ἡ μὲν ὤψα τε θεῶν εἰς ἡγεῖα εὐδὲ παύεται. εἰς γὰρ ἡγεῖα ἡ εἰκὼν εἰς ἐπαυσταῖο. ἡ δὲ θελησις καὶ ἀρχεῖται καὶ παύεται. Manuel Caleca De Principiis. Auctuarium Combesis, vol. 2. p. 222.

† Εἰς ὁ τε θεὸς λόγος παντοδύναμος τὰ συμπάντα καὶ ἀναγαγεῖ. ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ μία ψυχὴ καὶ μία λογικὴ δύναμις. De Laudibus Const. cap. 12. p. 753.

the



the *spirit*, says “ what then is the soul of  
 “ God ?” and he replies, that “ as every  
 “ thing that is ascribed to God, as hands,  
 “ fingers, eyes, feet, &c. means his attri-  
 “ butes, or powers ; perhaps by the soul  
 “ of God we are to understand his only  
 “ begotten Son ; for, as the soul, being dif-  
 “ fused through the whole body, animates  
 “ every thing, and does every thing, so the  
 “ only begotten Son of God, which is his  
 “ word, and his wisdom, extends to all the  
 “ attributes of God, and is diffused through  
 “ him\*.” M. Victorinus represents Christ  
 as “ the very being and action of the Fa-  
 “ ther,” and says in his answer to the  
 Arians, that “ God cannot be without ac-  
 “ tion†.” In another passage of the same

† Et si fas est audere nos in tali re amplius aliquid dicere.  
 potest fortasse anima Dei intelligi unigenitus filius ejus.  
 Sicut enim anima, per omne corpus inserta, movet om-  
 nia, et agitatur quæ operatur universa : ita et unigenitus  
 filius Dei, qui et verbum et sapientia ejus, pertingit et per-  
 venit ad omnem virtutem Dei, et insertus est ei. De  
 Principiis, Opera, vol. I. p. 703.

† Hoc enim quod λογος est : ipse enim λογος Deus est,  
 unum ergo et ομοσιόν, non enim sine actione Deus, sed

work, he calls Christ *the form of the Father*, defining *form*, if I understand him right, to be that which explains the being of a thing ; or, as he elsewhere says, *that by which God is seen* \*.

At length the absurdity of making Christ to be the proper reason, power, or will of God, seems to have struck some of the orthodox christians ; and then, having no other resource, they made the doctrine of the divinity of Christ to be a *mystery*, thinking by that means, to cut off all inquiry and objection. Ruffinus says, “ it is to “ be *believed* that God is the father of his “ own Son our Lord, and not to be *dis-*

intus operatur Deus, sicuti dictum. Substantia autem Dei imago est, actio, filiusque est, per quam intelligitur, et quod sit declaratur. Ad Arium, lib. i. Bib. Pat. vol. 5. p. 298.

\* Quoniam filius forma est patris : non autem nunc forma esse foris extra substantiam intelligitur, neque ut in nobis adjacens substantiæ facies, sed substantia quædam subsistens, in qua apparet et demonstratur quod occultatum et velatum est in alio. Deus autem ut velatum quiddam est : nemo enim videt Deum : forma igitur filius, in quo videtur Deus. Ibid. p. 311. 320.

“ *cursed*

“ *cuffed*. For slaves must not dispute about  
“ the birth of their masters\*.”

Theophylact says, that “ Christ is the  
“ *logos* of God, but neither the inward  
“ *logos*” (meaning reason) “ nor the ex-  
“ ternal *logos*” (meaning speech) “ nor any  
“ thing that can be explained by any pro-  
“ perty of man, being something peculiar  
“ to God †.” In this state the doctrine of  
the generation of the Son now rests, equally  
incapable of being understood, or defended.

We shall the less wonder at the extreme  
absurdity of the above quotations from the  
Fathers, when we consider what wretched

\* *Credendus est ergo Deus esse pater unici filii sui  
domini nostri, non discutiendus. Neque enim fas est servo  
de natalibus domini disputare.* In Symbol, p. 172.

† *Λογος* εστιν, εκ *εργον*, εδε *κλισμα*. διτις δε οντος τς *λογε*, ο μεν  
γαρ εστιν ενδιαθελος, ον κη μη λεγοντες εχομεν, φημι δη την τς λεγειν δυνα-  
μιν. κη ποιωμενος γαρ τις κη μη λεγων, ομως εχει τον λογον εν αυτω  
κειμενον, κη την δυναμιν εκ απεσθεν. ο μεν αν εστιν ενδιαθελος, ο δε  
προφορικος, ον κη δια των χειλεων προφερομεν, την τς λεγειν δυναμιν  
τς ενδιαθετε, κη εντος κειμενε, εις ενεργειαν προαγουτες. διτις τωων  
οντος τς *λογε*, εδελτερος τελων αεμοζει επι τς υις τς θεε, ετε γαρ προφορι-  
κος, ετε ενδιαθελος εστιν ο *λογος* τς θεε. εκεινοι μεν γαρ των φυσικων κη  
καθ ημας, ο δε τς παλρος *λογος* υπερ φυσικων, εχ υποβαλλεται τοις  
κατω τεχνολογημασιν. In John, cap. i. Opera, vol. i. p. 557.

metaphysicians both they and the Platonists before them, and indeed all the philosophers of antiquity, were; and that the idea of a proper personification was not difficult, after it had been agreed that *essence* and *power* were the same thing, which I have shewn to be the language of the Platonists; and the same occurs in some of the christian Fathers. Thus Cyril of Alexandria says that “the Father is a simple act or energy\*.” Maxentius also says, that “with respect to  
 “ God, who is of an impassible and incor-  
 “ ruptible nature, *nature* and *will* are the  
 “ same thing†.” M. Victorinus says, that  
 “ power and substance are the same things  
 “ in God‡.”

\* Actus vel efficacia Pater. De Trinitate, lib. 2. Opera, vol. 2. p. 386.

† Hæc quæ dicis compositæ et passibili naturæ sunt propria, impassibili autem et incompositæ non est aliud naturaliter aliud voluntarie quidpiam facere, sed prorsus unum atque idipsum est, quia ibi non aliud est natura, aliud voluntas, sed natura voluntas est, et voluntas natura. Bib. Pat. vol. 5. p. 527.

‡ Simul enim et filius, et in patre, et pater in filio: una ergo potentia, hoc est, una substantia existit, ibi enim  
 potentia

The difference, however, between these things was perceived by Eunomius; for M. Caleca says, that he made the divine essence and operation to be different things, and that he blamed the orthodox for confounding them\*. Palamas also asserted, that the divine essence and operation were different things; but on this account his antagonist M. Caleca calls him a polytheist †.

potentia, substantia: non enim aliud potentia, aliud substantia. Idem ergo ipsum est et patri et filio. Ad Arium, lib. I. Bib. Pat. vol. 5. p. 300.

\* Επιστηναι εκ ενιαυδα χρη, πως Ευνομιος διηρει μεν απο της εσιας την ενεργειαν, ως εγκλημα δε, την ταυτοτητα τοις ορθοδοξοις προσεφερε. Combefis, vol. 2. p. 34.

† Εκ των δηλον, οτι την ενεργειαν, ην διακρινεσθαι της εσιας λεγουσιν ταυτην η δεσχηλα η ακριβησιν ομολογουσι. Ibid. p. 3.

Ως ει τις πολλας θεοτητας παραδεξατο, τετον αναγκη η πολλας θεες ομολογειν. Ibid. p. 40.

## C H A P T E R III.

*The Defence of the preceding Doctrine by the Fathers.*

**I**T is no wonder that this strange doctrine of the generation of the Son from the attributes of the Father should bring the orthodox christians into some difficulties, and expose their scheme to objections ; or that, in order to defend it, they should have recourse to a variety of expedients. Accordingly, it appears, by the labour which they bestowed upon this subject, that the doctrine was, in fact, much objected to, and that, in their own opinion, it required to be well explained and defended.

The first thing which they had to guard against was the *diminution* of the substance of the Father by the production of a Son from himself ; and the next thing was to prevent the entire *separation* of the Son from the Father ; for then there would have been two *two Gods*, which the Gnostics, who

who held the doctrine of the emanation of all super-angelic beings from the divine essence, readily acknowledged. But this having been so long decried, as a doctrine of the Gnostics, and being exceedingly offensive to the great body of common people among christians, it could not be adopted.

It was hardly possible to find any *comparison* in nature by which they could remove both these objections to their doctrine at the same time, viz. the loss of substance in the Father by the generation of the Son, and the entire separation of the Son from him. All their explications, therefore, we find entirely fail in one respect or the other. The earliest of all the explanations of this doctrine is, that of the issuing of words from men. The philosophizing christians compared the emission of the *logos* from the Father to the emission of *logos*, or *reason*, from man, in speech or discourse; and, miserably lame as this explanation obviously is, many of them could find no better, and therefore they took much pains to answer the objections that

were made to it. Another famous comparison to which they had recourse in the earliest period, was the lighting of one torch at another. But though this did not take any thing from the light of the former torch, it made two distinct torches. Still, however, much use was made of this comparison, as being thought remarkably happy in answering one of the objections. But I must proceed to explain their manner of reasoning by extracts from their own writings.

---

## SECTION I.

*The Generation of the Son from the Father  
illustrated by the uttering of Words.*

TATIAN says concerning the generation of the logos from the Father, that “it is by division, not by avulsion, “because that which is cut off from its “origin is entirely removed from it; but “that which is divided” (or imparted)  
“taking



“ taking a portion of the œconomy\*, does  
 “ not leave that from which it was taken  
 “ destitute. For as many fires are lighted  
 “ by one torch, without any diminution of  
 “ its light; thus the logos emitted from  
 “ the power of the Father does not leave  
 “ him void of logos.” To explain this,  
 he adds, “ I speak, and you hear, but by  
 “ discoursing with you I do not become void  
 “ of logos, by the transmissiion of my logos  
 “ to you; but I propose, by the emissiion  
 “ of my voice, to arrange some unformed  
 “ matter in you†.” This he, no doubt,

\* This, as part of a *general proposition*, is a very obscure expression. Had he been describing the emissiion of the Son from the Father in particular, it would have meant his assuming *proper personality*, in order to his taking part in the plan that was formed for the redemption of man, which is often called *the œconomy*. This phrase is, therefore, generally synonymous to *the incarnation* with the Fathers.

† Γεγονε δε καλα μερισμον, ε καλα αποκοπην. το γαρ απολημθεν  
 τε πρωτε κεχωριται, το δε μερισθεν οικονομιας την αιρεσιν προσλαβου  
 εν ενδεα τον οθεν ειληπται πεποινηκεν. ωσπερ γαρ απο μιας δαδος  
 αναπτελει μεν πυρα πολλα, της δε πρωτης δαδος δια την εξαψιν των  
 πολλων δαδων εν ελαττειται το φως\* εγω κ' ο λογος προελθων εν της  
 τε παλρος δυναμει, εν αλογον πεποινηκε τον γεγεννηκοτα. κ' γαρ  
 αυτος εγω λαλω, κ' υμεις ακελευε κ' ε δηπε δια της μεταφρασεως τε λογε,  
 κενος

meant to be a complete illustration of the emission of the *logos* from the Father, in order to arrange the matter of the chaos out of which the world was made.

To this explication it was obvious to object, that the emission of a word in speech is no *generation* of any thing, words being empty sounds, and nothing permanent. But the reply to this was, that words are empty things, and leave nothing permanent only when uttered by *man*; but that this is not the case with the words of *God*; the difference in the being from which they proceed making a corresponding difference in the things which proceed from them. In the following passages Tertullian states this hypothesis, with the proof of it from the scriptures, before he replies to the objection which I have mentioned.

“ Then therefore did the word (*Sermo*) assume its form, and dress, its sound and voice, when God said, *Let there be light*.  
 “ This is the perfect nativity of the word,

καὶ οὕτως ὁ προσομιλῶν λόγος γίνεσθαι • προβαλλόμενος δὲ τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ φωνήν, ἐκπορεύμεν τὴν ἐν ὑμῖν ἀκοσμήτην ὕλην πρῶτον. Ad Græcos, sect. 8. Opera, p. 22.

“ when

“ when it proceeded from God, being first  
“ formed by him under the name of *wisdom*.  
“ *The Lord formed me the beginning of his*  
“ *ways*. Then it was effectually generated.  
“ *When he prepared the heavens I was present*  
“ *with him*. By proceeding from whom he  
“ became his son, his first-born, as being be-  
“ gotten before all things, and *only begot-*  
“ *ten*, as being alone generated out of God,  
“ from the womb of his heart; as the Fa-  
“ ther himself testifies, when he says, *My*  
“ *heart is throwing out a good word*, to  
“ whom rejoicing, the Father also rejoicing  
“ says, *Thou art my Son, this day have I be-*  
“ *gotten thee*. Before *Lucifer* have I begotten  
“ *thee*. So the Son also, under the name of  
“ *wisdom*, confesses the Father. *The Lord*  
“ *formed me the beginning of his ways; before*  
“ *the hills* has he begotten me. For if here  
“ *wisdom* seems to say that she was made for  
“ his works, and ways, in another place it  
“ is shown that all things are made by his  
“ word, and without it was nothing made.  
“ And again, *by his word were the heavens*  
“ *made, and all their hosts by his spirit,*  
“ viz. the spirit which is in the word.

“ So

“ So that it is the same power which is  
 “ sometimes called *wisdom*, and sometimes  
 “ *the word*\*.”

His stating of the objection, and his answer to it are as follow: “ You suppose  
 “ this *Sermo* to be a substance, &c.—What,

\* Tunc igitur etiam ipse sermo speciem et ornatum suum sumit. sonum et vocem, cum dicit Deus, fiat lux. Hæc est nativitas perfecta sermonis, dum ex Deo procedit: conditus ab eo primum ad cogitatum in nomine sophiæ, dominus condidit me initium viarum. Dehinc generatus ad effectum: Cum pararet cœlum, aderam illic simul. Exinde eum parem sibi faciens, de quo procedendo filius factus est, primogenitus, ut ante omnia genitus; et unigenitus, ut solus ex Deo genitus: proprie de vulva cordis ipsius, secundum quod et pater ipse testatur, cruciavit cor meum sermonem optimum. Ad quem deinceps gaudens proinde gaudentem in persona illius, filius meus es tu, ego hodie genui te. Et ante Luciferum genui te. Sic et filius ex sua persona profitetur patrem in nomine sophiæ, dominus condidit me initium viarum in opera sua. Ante omnes autem coelos generavit me. Nam si hic quidem sophia videtur dicere conditam se a domino in opera et vias ejus: alibi autem per sermonem ostenditur omnia facta esse, et sine illa nihil factum: sicut et rursus, sermone ejus cœli confirmati sunt, et spiritu ejus omnes vires eorum; utique eo spiritu qui sermoni inerat: apparet unam eandem que vim esse nunc in nomine sophiæ, nunc in appellatione sermonis. Ad Praxeam, sect. 5, 6, 7. Opera, p. 503.

“ say

“ say you, is speech, but the voice and sound  
 “ of the mouth, with a kind of vacuity,  
 “ empty, and incorporeal. But I say that  
 “ nothing empty and having vacuity can  
 “ proceed from God, as it does not proceed  
 “ from what is empty and vacuity ; nor  
 “ can that want substance, which proceeds  
 “ from so great a substance, and which has  
 “ made so many substances\*.”

Lactantius answered the same objection  
 in the same manner. “ Our breathings are  
 “ dissoluble, because we are mortal ; but  
 “ the breathings of God live, remain, and  
 “ have essence, because he is immortal, the

\* Ergo ; inquis, das aliquam substantiam esse sermonem, spiritu et sophiæ traditione constructam plane. Non vis enim eum substantivum habere in re per substantiæ proprietatem, ut res et persona quædam videri possit, et ita capiat secundus a Deo constitutus duos efficere, patrem et filium, Deum et sermonem. Quid est enim, dices, sermo, nisi vox et sonus oris et (sicut grammatici tradunt) aër offensus, intelligibilis auditu ; ceterum, vacuum nescio quid, et inane, et incorporale ? At ego nihil dico de Deo inane et vacuum prodire putuisse, ut non de inani et vacuo prolatum ; nec carere substantia, quod de tanta substantia processit, et tantas substantias fecit. Ad Praxeam, sect. 5. cap. 7. Opera, p. 503.

“ giver

“giver of essence and life\*.” The same answer is given by Origen, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Austin, and, I believe, many others. “The logos of God,” says Origen, “is not like that of all other persons. No other logos is living; no other logos is God, no other logos was in the beginning with him whose logos it was†.” “The word of man,” says Epiphanius, “vanishes, but the word of God abideth,” alluding to Ps. cxviii. 89 ‡.

Athanasius having spoken of the Father as the only God, because he only is unbegotten (*αγεννητος*) and the fountain of deity;

\* *Nostri spiritus dissolubiles sunt, quia mortales sumus. Dei autem spiritus et vivunt, et manent, et sentiunt; quia ipse immortalis est, et sensus, et vitæ dator. Instit. lib. 4. sect. 8. p. 371.*

† *Οὐτε γὰρ ὁ λόγος αὐτὸς τοιοῦτος ἐστίν, ὅποιος ὁ πάντων λόγος. ὁ δὲν γὰρ ὁ λόγος ζῶν, ὁ δὲν ὁ λόγος θεός. ὁ δὲν γὰρ ὁ λόγος ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ἦν, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν. In Jer. Hom. 19. Comment. vol. 1. p. 184.*

‡ *Οὐ γὰρ ὁ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου λόγος, ἀνθρώπος πρὸς τὸν ἀνθρώπον. εἴτε γὰρ ζῇ, εἴτε ὑπέρῃ. καρδίας δὲ ζωῆς καὶ ὑφέσεως κίνημα ἐστὶ μόνον, καὶ οὐκ ὑποστασις. λεγέσθαι γὰρ αἶμα, καὶ παραχρημα ἐκεῖ ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ λαλῶμεν διαμενεῖ. τὰ δὲ θεῶν ὁ λόγος, ὡς φησὶ, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐν ἑομαλὶ τῆς Προφητείας. ὁ λόγος σὺ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα διαμενεῖ. Hær. 60. Opera, vol. 1. p. 609.*

and

and of the Son as only *God of God*, says, in answer to the question how this *logos* can become a person in God, when it is not so in man, “the word conceived in the mind of man does not become *man of man*, “since it does not live or subsist, but is “only the motion of a living and subsisting “heart. When it is pronounced it has no “continuance, and being often uttered does “not remain; whereas the psalmist says, “*the word of the Lord remaineth for ever*, “and the Evangelist agrees with him, &c.\*”

Ruffinus makes the same comparison between the emission of the *logos* in God, and man, but hints that they are both equally mysterious. Treating of this subject, he says, “Explain first, if you can, how the “mind which is within you generates a “word, and how the spirit of memory is “in it; and though these are different in

\* Ου γαρ ο λογος τε ανθρωπος ανθρωπος εστιν παρ ανθρωπον • επει μητε ζων εστι, μητε υφετως, αλλα ζωης καρδιας η υφεωσσης κίνημα μονον. η λεγεται παραχρημα, η εκ εστι. η πολλας καλεμεν, εδεσποει διαμενει • τον δε τε θεον λογον ανωθεν, ο ψαλμωδης κεκραγει λεγων, εις τον αιωνα ο λογος σε διαμενει εν τω θρανω. η συμφανως αυτω ο θεον ειναι τε λογον ομολογων ο Ευαγγελιστης, &c. De æterna Substantia Filii, &c. Contra Sabellii Gregales, Opera, vol. 1. p. 651.

“ things and acts, yet they are one in substance and nature ; and though they proceed from the mind, they are never separated from it \*.”

Lactantius proposes and speaks to another difficulty on this subject. For the *angels* being likewise called *spirits*, or *breathings* of God, there was some danger lest they should be considered as beings of the same rank with the *logos* in Christ. But this writer observes, that there is a difference between a *word* which is emitted with a *sound*, and a mere *breathing*, which is emitted without that circumstance ; and this, according to him, sufficiently accounts for the difference between Christ and the angels.

“ How,” says this writer, “ did he” (the father) “ procreate him” (the word) ? “ In the first place the works of God cannot be known, nor told by any person. But we learn in the holy scriptures, that the

\* Expedi primo si potes, quomodo mens, quæ intra te est generet verbum, et qui sit in ea memoriæ spiritus : quomodo hæc cum diversa sint rebus et actibus, unum tamen sint vel substantia vel natura, et cum e mente procedant, nunquam tamen ab ipsa separentur. In Symbol. Opera, p. 172.



“ Son of God is the word of God, or rea-  
“ son ; also that the other angels of God  
“ are spirits, i. e. *breathings*. For a word  
“ is a breathing emitted with a sound, ex-  
“ pressive of something. But because *breath-*  
“ *ings* and a *word* are emitted from different  
“ parts (for *breathings* proceed from the  
“ nostrils, and a word from the mouth)  
“ there is a great difference between the  
“ Son of God and the other angels. For  
“ they are *silent breathings*, emitted from  
“ God, because they were created for *ser-*  
“ *vice*, and not for the delivering the doc-  
“ trine of God. But though he is also a  
“ spirit, yet since he issues from the mouth  
“ of God, with a voice, and a sound, like a  
“ word, for this reason he was to make use  
“ of his voice to the people, because he was  
“ to teach with authority the doctrine of  
“ God, and communicate heavenly secrets  
“ to men \*.”

\* Quomodo igitur procreavit? Primum nec sciri a quoquam possunt, nec narrari opera divina ; sed tamen sanctæ literæ docent ; in quibus cautum est illum Dei filium, Dei esse sermonem ; sive etiam rationem ; itemque cæteros angelos Dei spiritus esse. Nam sermo est spiritus cum voce aliquid significante prolatus. Sed tamen quo-

Abfurd as is this notion of the generation of the Son by merely uttering a word, we find the fame, or fimilar explanations of this doctrine after the council of Nice. Auſtin ſays, “ The Father ſhews every thing to the “ Son, and in ſhewing, generates the Son \*.” But in another paſſage he makes a difference between the uttering of a word in man and in God. “ We do not,” he ſays, “ *generate* “ ſounding words, but we *make* them †.” But Cyril of Alexandria, quoting Pf. 44. *My heart is throwing out a good matter*, ſays, “ The Father produces the Son without “ paſſion, as a wiſe man, out of his own

niam ſpiritus, et fermo diverſis partibus proferuntur ; ſi quidem ſpiritus naribus, ore fermo procedit ; magna inter hunc Dei filium, et cœteros angelos differentia eſt. Illi enim ex Deo taciti ſpiritus exierunt ; quia non ad doctrinam Dei tradendam, ſed ad miniſterium creabantur. Ille vero cum fit et ipſe ſpiritus ; tamen cum voce, ac ſono ex Dei ore proceſſit, ſicut verbum, ea ſcilicet ratione, quia voce ejus ad populum fuerat uſurus ; id eſt, quod ille magiſter futurus eſſet doctrinæ Dei, et cœleſtis arcani ad homines perferendi. Inſtit. lib. 4. ſect. 8. p. 371.

\* Pater oſtendit filio quod facit, et oſtendendo filium gignit. In. John. Tr. 23. cap. 5. Opera, vol. 9. p. 204.

† Nos quippe non gignimus ſonantia verba, ſed facimus. De Symbol. cap. 1. Opera, vol. 3. p. 141.

“ wiſdom,

“ wisdom, produces any work that he has  
 “ thought of, as of geometry, or music,  
 “ &c\*.”

This comparison of the word of God to that of man, we find so late as Fulgentius, who also infers the dignity of the word from the dignity of the mind that produces it†.

\* Præterea, sic ex seipso, absque passione, filium genuit pater, sicut si sapiens ex sapientia sua quicquam excogitaverit atque pepererit, veluti geometriam, musicam aut aliquid hujusmodi. Thesaurus, lib. 1. cap. 7. Opera, vol. 2. p. 229.

† Sed sic est verbum apud Deum, sicut est in mente verbum, sicut in corde consilium : cum enim mens apud se verbum habet, utique cogitando habet, quia nihil aliud est apud se dicere, quam apud se cogitare. Cum ergo mens cogitat, et cogitando verbum intra se generat, de sua substantia generat verbum, et sic illud verbum generat de se, ut genitum habeat apud se. Nec minus aliquid habet verbum, quod ex mente nascitur quam est mens de qua nascitur, quia quanta est mens quæ generat verbum, tantum est etiam ipsum verbum. Ad Monimum, lib. 3. cap. 7. p. 439.

## SECTION II.

*The Generation of the Son from the Father illustrated by the prolation of a branch of a tree from the root, &c.*

HAVING, I imagine, pursued this phantom far enough, I shall proceed to consider the generation of the Son from the Father in a more substantial manner, viz. as that of *a branch from a root*, or *a river from a spring*, &c. which was likewise very common with the early Fathers. This, however, came so near to the system of the Gnostic *emanation* of celestial beings from the supreme mind, that it could not but give some alarm. This objection, therefore, those who have recourse to this explanation of the generation of the Son endeavour to guard against.

We see, in Athenagoras, what great stress was laid on the idea of a *perfect union* between the Father and the Son. He says, that “as all things are subject to the emperor, and his son, so all things are sub-  
1
“ject

“ject to the one God, and him who is by  
 “him considered as his son, but *undivided*  
 “from him \*.”

Tertullian, in his answer to the objections that were made to the generation of the Son from the Father, seems to have aimed at nothing besides making out a scheme different from that of the Gnostics, which, in his time, was a doctrine peculiarly offensive. All his object, therefore, is to shew that the Son, though deriving his being from the Father, still remained united to him. “If any one,” says he, “thinks  
 “that I am introducing some *probole*, that  
 “is the production of one thing from another, as Valentinus makes, by producing  
 “one of his æons from another.---Valen-  
 “tinus separates his *proboles* from their au-  
 “thor, and so far, that the æon does not  
 “know his father.—But with us the Son  
 “only knows the Father.—For God pro-  
 “duced his word — as a root produces a  
 “branch, a fountain a river, and the sun a

\* Ως γαρ υμιν πατρι κ' υιω παντα κεχειρωται, ανωθεν την βασι-  
 λειαν ειληφοι, εως ενι τω θεω κ' τω παρ αυτς λογω υιω νοημενω αμε-  
 ρισω παντα υποβελανται. Apol. p. 140.

“ beam of light. For these things are the  
 “ *proboles* of their respective substances —  
 “ Neither is the branch separated from the  
 “ root, the river from the fountain, or the  
 “ beam from the sun. So neither is the  
 “ *word* from God. So that, according to  
 “ this example, I profess that I make God  
 “ and his word two, the Father and his  
 “ Son. For the root and branch are two,  
 “ but joined. The fountain and the river  
 “ are two, but undivided ; and the sun and  
 “ the beam are two, but cohering \*.”

\* Hoc si qui putaverit me *προβολην* aliquam introducere,  
 Id est, prolationem rei alterius ex altera, quod facit Valen-  
 tinus, alium atque alium æonem de æone producens.——  
 Valentinus probolas suas discernit et separat ab autore : et  
 ita longe ab eo ponit, ut æon patrem nesciat.——Apud  
 nos autem solus filius patrem novit, et finem patris ipse ex-  
 posuit, et omnia apud patrem audivit et vidit ; et quæ man-  
 datus est a patre, ea et loquitur.——Protulit enim Deus  
 sermonem, quamadmodum etiam paracletus docet, sicut  
 radix fruticem, et fons fluvium, et sol radium. Nam et  
 iste species probolæ sunt earum substantiarum, ex quibus  
 prodeunt.——Nec frutex tamen a radice, nec fluvius a  
 fonte, nec radius a sole discernitur, sicut nec a Deo sermo.  
 Igitur secundum horum exemplorum formam, profiteor me  
 duos dicere, Deum et sermonem ejus, patrem et filium  
 ipsius. Nam et radix et frutex duæ res sunt, sed con-  
 junctæ,

This writer's fear of making a separation between the Son and the Father appears very strongly in the following passage, which has a view to the unitarians, to whom he thought it necessary to make frequent apologies. "He that is un-  
 " learned, or perverse, takes this in a wrong  
 " sense, as if I favoured a *diversity*, and as  
 " if this diversity implied a *separation* of  
 " the Father and the Son. This I urge  
 " from necessity, when they contend that  
 " the Father, Son, and Spirit, must be *the*  
 " *same*, flattering the monarchy against the  
 " œconomy; when I say that making  
 " the Son another from the Father, I do  
 " not make him *different* from him, but  
 " only maintain a distribution. I do not  
 " make a division, but a distinction. For  
 " the Father and Son are not the same, nor  
 " yet another, from another model. For  
 " the Father is all substance; but the Son  
 " a part of this substance, and a portion,

*junctæ; et fons et flumen duæ species sunt, sed indivisæ;  
 et sol et radius duæ formæ sunt, sed coherentes. Adv.  
 Praxeam, sect. 8. Opera, p. 504.*

“ as he himself professes, The Father is  
“ greater than I\*.”

We see the same care to guard against a division of the Father and Son in Hippolytus. “ By speaking of *another*,” he says, “ I do not make *two Gods*, but as light from light, water from the spring, or a beam of light from the sun. For the power of the whole is one; the Father is the whole, and the logos is his power†.”

On another occasion Tertullian says that the term *προβολή* (*probole*) which had been much used by the Gnostics, was not the

\* Male accipit idiotæ quisque aut perversus hoc dictum, quasi diversitatem sonet, et ex diversitate separationem pretendat, patris et filii et spiritus. Necessitate autem hoc dico, cum eundem patrem et filium et spiritum contendunt, adversus œconomiam monarchiæ adulantes, non tamen diversitate alium filium a patre, sed distributione; nec divisione alium, sed distinctione; quia non sit idem pater et filius, vel modulo alius ab alio. Pater enim tota substantia est: filius vero derivatio totius et portio, sicut ipse profitetur, quia pater major me est. Adv. Praxeam, sect. 9. Opera, p. 504.

† Καὶ εἰως παριστάτῳ αὐτῷ εἶπερος. Ἐλερον λεγὼν ἔ δυο θεας λεγῶ ἀλλ' ὡς φῶς ἐκ φωτός. ἢ ὡς ὕδωρ ἐκ πηγῆς, ἢ ὡς ἀκίνητα ἀπὸ ἡλίου. Δυναμὶς γὰρ μία ἢ ἐκ τῆ παντός, τὸ δὲ παν Πατὴρ, ἐξ ἔ δυναμὶς λόγος. Contra Noetum, sect. 11. Opera, p. 13.

worfe



worse on that account, and therefore he should not scruple to make use of it in his own sense, or the corresponding Latin term *prolatio*. Speaking of the Son, “he was,” he says, “prolated out of God, and generated by prolation, and therefore the Son of God, and called God from an unity of substance.” He then compares this prolation of the Son from the Father, to one light produced from another, without any loss of the original light—“This ray of God,” he says, “going into a certain virgin, became flesh in her womb, and was born a man, mixed with God. The flesh animated by the spirit is nourished, grows up, speaks, teaches, operates, and is Christ\*.” In after times,

\* Hunc ex Deo prolatum dicimus, et prolatione generatum, et id circo filium Dei, et Deum dictum ex unitate substantiæ, nam et Deus spiritus, et cum radius ex sole porrigitur, portio ex summa; sed sol erit in radio, quia solis est radius, nec separatur substantia, sed extenditur. Ita de spiritu spiritus, et de Deo Deus, ut lumen de lumine accensum, manet integra et indefecta materie matrix, etsi plures inde traduces qualitatum mutueris. Ita et quod de Deo profectum est, Deus est, et Dei filius et unus ambo. Ita et de spiritu spiritus, et de Deo Deus. Modulo alterum,

the Arians charged the orthodox with this doctrine of *prolation*, as not differing from that of the Gnostics\*.

Tertullian was so far carried away with this idea of *generation*, that, always delivering himself without reserve, and as clearly as he possibly could, he appears not to have been very solicitous about maintaining the proper *unity* of the Father and Son, attending only to this one circumstance, that they were of *the same substance*, and strictly *connected*. “The persons in the trinity,”

alterum, non numero; gradu non statu fecit. Et a matrice non recessit, sed excessit. Iste igitur Dei radius, ut retro semper prædicabatur, delapsus in virginem quamdam, et in utero ejus caro figuratus, nascitur homo Deo mistus, caro spiritu instructa nutritur, adolescit, affatur, docet, operatur, et Christus est. Apol. sect. 21. Opera, p. 19.

\* Volentes igitur hæretici, Dei filium non ex Deo esse, neque de natura, et in natura Dei ex Deo Deum natum, cum jam superius commemorassent unum Deum solum verum, neque adjecissent, et patrem, ut unius veritatis esse patrem, et filium exclusa proprietate nativitatis negarent dixerunt. Nec ut Valentinus prolatione natum patris commentatus est: ut sub specie hæreseos Valentinianæ, nomine prolationis improbato, nativitatem Dei ex Deo improbarent. Hilary, lib. 6. Opera, p. 102.

says

says he, “are three, not in state, but  
 “degree, not in substance, but in form;  
 “not in power, but appearance; but of  
 “one substance, and one state, and one  
 “power, because there is one God, from  
 “whom those degrees, forms, and spe-  
 “cies, in the name of Father, Son, and  
 “Spirit are deputed\*.” He therefore ob-  
 serves, that when our Saviour said, *I and my  
 Father are one*, he used the neuter gender.  
 “He says *unum*, in the neuter gender, which  
 “does not imply *one person*, but unity,  
 “likeness, conjunction, the love of the  
 “Father to the Son, and the obedience of  
 “the Son to the will of the Father†.”  
 This respected the Sabellians, who laid great

\* Tres autem non statu, sed gradu; nec substantia, sed forma; nec potestate, sed specie; unius autem substantiæ, et unius status, et unius potestatis; quia unus Deus, ex quo et gradus isti et formæ et species, in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti deputantur. Ad Praxeam, sect. 2. p. 501.

† Unum dicit, neutrali verbo, quod non pertinet ad singularitatem, sed ad unitatem, ad similitudinem, ad conjunctionem, ad dilectionem patris, qui filium diligit, et ad obsequium filii, qui voluntati patris obsequitur. Ibid. sect. 22. Opera, p. 513.

stress on Christ's saying that he and the Father were one. These were the philosophical unitarians, who adhered strictly to the doctrine of one God.

With a view to the unitarians, who were the majority of the common christians in the time of Tertullian, as he particularly acknowledges, he is obliged to use a good deal of management, and though he contends for the propriety of calling the Son *God*, as *a branch* from God the Father, yet so great was the superiority of the Father to the Son, that he says he does not chuse to call the Son God, when the Father had been mentioned immediately before. “ I  
“ do not absolutely say that there are Gods,  
“ and Lords, but I follow the apostle;  
“ and if the Father and the Son are to be  
“ named together, I call the Father God,  
“ and Jesus Christ Lord, though I can call  
“ Christ God, as the apostle, when he says  
“ of *whom is Christ, who is God over all*  
“ *blest for ever*. For, separately taken, I  
“ call a beam of light the sun; but speak-  
“ ing of the sun, whose beam it is, I do  
“ not immediately call the beam the sun.  
“ For,

“ For, though I do not make two suns, yet  
 “ I say that the sun and his beam are two  
 “ things, and two species of one undivided  
 “ substance; like God and his word, the  
 “ Father and the Son\*.”

The ideas of Lactantius on this subject seem to have been very much the same with those of Tertullian, as has been seen in former instances; and like him, he is chiefly careful to guard against the *separation* of the Son from the substance of the Father, lest he should make different gods. “ When we say that the Father is God, and the Son God, we do not mean

\* Itaque deos omnino non dicam, nec dominos; sed apostolum sequar, ut si pariter nominandi fuerint pater et filius, Deum patrem appellem, et Jesum Christum Dominum nominem. Solum autem Christum potero, Deum dicere, sicut idem apostolus. Ex quibus Christus, qui est inquit, Deus super omnia benedictus in ævum omne. Nam et radium solis seorsum solem vocabo; solem autem nominans cujus est radius, non statim et radium solem appellabo. Nam etsi soles duos non faciam, tamen et solem et radium ejus tam duas res, et duas species unius indivisæ substantiæ numerabo, quam Deum et sermonem ejus, quam patrem et filium. Ad Praxeam, sect. 13. Opera, p. 507.

“ a different

“ a different God, nor do we separate them.  
“ For neither can the Father be without a  
“ Son, nor the Son without a Father. Nor  
“ can the Son be separated from the Fa-  
“ ther ; as the Father cannot have his name  
“ without the Son, nor the Son be gene-  
“ rated without a Father. Since, there-  
“ fore, the Father produces a Son, and the  
“ Son becomes one, there is one mind, one  
“ spirit, one substance, common to them  
“ both. But the Father is like an exu-  
“ berant fountain, and the Son a river  
“ flowing from it. The Father is as the  
“ sun, the Son as a beam stretched from  
“ the sun ; who, because he is faithful, and  
“ dear to the Father, is not separated from  
“ him, as the river is not separated from  
“ the spring, nor the beam of light from  
“ the sun ; because the water of the spring  
“ is in the river, and the light of the sun  
“ in the beam. In like manner, neither  
“ is the voice separated from the mouth,  
“ nor the power, or the hand, separated  
“ from the body. When the same person  
“ is called by the prophets the *hand of God*,  
“ and the *power*, and the *word of God*,  
“ there

“ there is no separation between them.  
“ For the tongue subservient to the speech,  
“ and the hand, in which is power, are  
“ inseparable parts of the body\*.”

Tertullian appears, however, not a little embarrassed with the question how the Father can be called *the one God*, if the Son, though connected with him, can, in any proper sense, even where the Father is not mentioned, be called *God*; but he seems to satisfy himself with saying, that as the proper stile of the Father before he had a Son

\* Cum dicimus Deum patrem, et Deum filium, non diversum dicimus, nec utrumque secernimus, quia nec pater sine filio potest; nec filius a patre secerni, siquidem nec pater sine filio nuncupari, nec filius potest sine patre generari. Cum igitur et pater filium faciat, et filius fiat; una utrique mens, unus spiritus, una substantia est; sed ille quasi exuberans fons est; hic tanquam defluens ex eo rivus, ille tanquam sol; hic quasi radius a sole porrectus, qui quoniam summo patri et fidelis, et carus est, non separatur, sicut nec rivus a fonte, nec radius a sole; quia et aqua fontis in rivo est, et solis lumen in radio. *Æque neque vox ab ore sejungi, nec virtus, aut manus a corpore divelli potest.* Cum igitur a prophetis idem manus Dei, et virtus, et sermo dicatur, utique nulla discretio est; quia et lingua sermonis ministra est, et manus, in qua est virtus, individuae sunt corporis portiones. *Lib. 4. sect. 29. p. 446.*

was that of *the one God*, he could not lose it in consequence of having a Son, especially as that Son derives his divinity from his inseparable connexion with the Father.

“ Without injuring the rights of the Son, “ the Father,” he says, “ may be called *the only God*, which was his original title, “ whenever he is named without the Son. “ But he is named without the Son when he “ is spoken of as the *first person*, which is to “ be named before that of the Son ; because “ the Father is first known, and the Son “ after the Father. Wherefore there is one “ God the Father, and no other besides “ him ; which when he says, he does not “ deny the Son, but some other God ; for “ the Son is not *another* from the Father— “ as if the sun had said, I am the sun, and “ besides me there is no other, except my “ beam \*.”

\* Salvo enim filio, recte unicum Deum potest determinasse, cujus est filius. Non enim definit esse qui habet filium ipse unicus, suo scilicet nomine, quotiens sine filio nominatur. Sine filio autem nominatur, cum principaliter determinatur ut prima persona, quæ ante filii nomen erat proponenda ; quia pater ante cognoscitur, et post patrem filius nominatur. Igitur unus Deus pater, et alius absque



One of Austin's explanations of the generation of the Son bears some resemblance to those of a branch from the root, and of a river from a spring; but a much greater to the Gnostic prolations. "As the Son," says he, "is from the Father, so the woman is from the man," meaning Eve from Adam\*. For here unhappily the woman was intirely detached from the man.

In the oration of Constantine the union of the Son with the Father is preserved on a more metaphysical principle, viz. that of the divine nature having no relation to place. "For he that came from him is united to him again; for the separation and union, being not *topically*, but *intellectually*, that which is produced was attended with no

eo non est. Quod ipse inferens, non filium negat, sed alium Deum, ceterum, alius a patre filius non est.—Alium enim etiam filium fecisset, quem de aliis excepisset. Puta solem dicere: Ego sol, et alius præter me non est, nisi radius meus. Ad Praxeam, sect. 18. Opera, p. 510.

\* Ut quemadmodum de patre est filius, sic et de viro mulier. Questiones in V. T. 21. Opera, vol. 4. p. 713.

“ loss of any thing within the Father, as  
 “ in the case of seeds \*.”

Justin Martyr, and others, thought that the comparison of lighting one lamp at another happily illustrated the production of the Son from the Father. But it was afterwards perceived that, according to this, there must be an intire *separation* between them. On this idea Hilary objects to it as having been used by Hierax †.

\* Ο δε εξ εμεινς έχων την αναφοραν, εις εμεινον ενούσαι παλιν \* εμεινω της διαστασεως δυήμισεως τε. & τοπικως, αλλα νοερως γινομενης \* & γαρ ζημα τινι των πατρων σπλαγχνων συνετη το γεννηθεν, ωσπερ αμελει τα εκ σπερμάτων. Cap. 3. p. 676.

† Sed nec ficut Hierachas lucernam de lucerna, vel lampadem in duas partes. De Trinitate lib. 6. p. 105.

## SECTION III.

*Why only one Son was generated, the Objection of Generation implying Passion considered, and why the Son and Holy Spirit did not generate, &c.*

ANOTHER difficulty that remained with the orthodox, was to account for the Father having no more than *one Son*; and for this different reasons are given, but all of them, as will be imagined, very lame ones. If," says Athanasius, "they suppose the Father to generate at all, it is better, and more pious, to say that God is the Father of only one logos, who is the fulness of his Godhead, and in whom are all the treasures of knowledge\*."

Another reason, given by Rufinus, is more curious, but not more satisfactory. "We believe," says he, "in one only Son of

\* Εἰ γὰρ ὁλως γενῆναι αὐτὸν ὑπονοοῦσιν, βέλτιον ἐστὶ καὶ εὐσεβεστερον λέγειν εἶναι λόγον γεννητὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅς ἐστι τὸ πλῆρωμα τῆς Θεότητος αὐτοῦ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ οἱ θησαυροὶ πάσης τῆς γνώσεως εἰσι. Oratio Brevis, Opera, vol. 2. p. 25.

“ God, our Lord; for one is generated  
 “ from one, as the splendor of one light,  
 “ and there is one word of the heart. Nei-  
 “ ther does incorporeal generation proceed  
 “ to the plural number, nor does it fall  
 “ into division; where that which is gene-  
 “ rated is never separated from that which  
 “ generates it. It is one, as sense to the  
 “ mind, as a word to the heart, as courage  
 “ to the brave, and wisdom to the wise\*.”  
 He owns, however, that these examples are  
 imperfect.

The following answer of Eusebius tends  
 rather to satisfy us, that it is *better* that  
 there should be but one Son of God than  
 more of them; but for the reason that he  
 alledges, it would have been better still that  
 there had been no Son at all. “ There can  
 “ be only one Son of God, because in more  
 “ there would be diversity, and difference,

\* Unicum hunc esse filium Dei dominum nostrum.  
 Unus enim de uno nascitur: quia et splendor unius est lu-  
 cis, et unum est verbum cordis: nec in numerum plura-  
 lem defluit incorporea generatio, nec in divisionem cadit,  
 ubi qui nascitur nequaquam a generante separatur. Unicus  
 est ut menti sensus, ut cordi verbum, ut forti virtus, ut sa-  
 pientia sapienti. In Symbol, p. 174.

“and an introduction of evil\*.” He also compares this case to the emission of light, and not darkness, from the sun; but then it is obvious to remark that there might have been many beams of light from the same sun.

A much more formidable objection still to this doctrine of paternal generation was, that it implies *passion*, from which it was an incontrovertible maxim, that the divine nature is exempt. It was particularly a maxim with the Platonists, and is expressed by Plato himself†, that generation is always accompanied with passion. “Had it been said,” says Basil, “in the beginning was the Son, and not the logos, it would have given us an idea of passion‡.” But the answer to this was, that this mysterious generation of an incorporeal being was a very different thing from that

\* Εν γαρ πλειοσιν ελεροίης εσαι κ' διαφορά κ' τε χειρόνος εισαγωγή. Demonstratio, lib. 4. cap. 3. p. 147.

† Γίγνεται δὴ πάντων γενεσίς, ηνικ' αν τι παδος η · δηλον ως οποιαν αρχη λαβεται αυξην, εις την δευτεραν ελθη μελαεσιν. Plato De Legibus, lib. 10. p. 668. Ed Genevæ.

‡ Ει δε ειπεν εν αρχη ην ο υιος, τη προσηγορια τε υις συνεισηλθεν αν σοι η περι τε παδος εννοια. Hom. 16. Opera, vol. 1. p. 436.

which is so called in corporeal ones. In answer to those who said that God would be diminished if he produced a Son from himself, Origen thought it sufficient to say, "You consider God as corporeal\*." And the same answer was thought to suffice for this objection. G. Nazianzen, in answer to the question, "how generation can be "without passion," says, "because God is "incorporeal†." Again he says, "the "Deity is without passion, though he generates‡."

It should seem from the pains that were taken to answer this objection to the doctrine of generation by the eternal Father, that it was much ridiculed by the profane and heretical wits of that age. They said that "to the act of generation there must "be the concurrence of two persons." To

\* Ακολουθεῖ δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ σῶμα λεγεῖν τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν, καὶ διηγεσθαι τὸν πατέρα, ὅτι ἐστὶ ὁμοίωμα ἀνθρώπων, μὴδ' ὅτι φύσιν ἀσώματος καὶ ἀσώματος πεφασίαςμενον, ἔσαν κυρίως ἑστάν· οἱ δὲ ὁμολογῶντες ὅτι ἐν σώματι τοῦ πατρὸς τὸν πατέρα, καὶ τὸν υἱόν τοῦτον ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ αὐτῶς ἐπιδεδημιγμένον, τὸ εἶναι, καὶ ἔχει καὶ αὐτῶς ἐκ καὶ αὐτῶς, ὡς περ ἡμεῖς ἐξείληφαμεν. Comment, vol. 2. p. 306.

† Πῶς ἐν ἐκ ἐμπαθῆς ἡ γενέσις; ὅτι ἀσώματος. Or. 35. p. 563.

‡ Ἀπαθὲς γὰρ τὸ θεῖον, καὶ εἰ γεγενῆκεν. Ibid. Or. 23. p. 422.

this

this Ruffinus gravely answers, “ Do not  
 “ think that God needs any marriage to ge-  
 “ nerate a Son.” “ My heart,” he fays,  
 “ throws out a good logos, (i. e.) I have  
 “ from eternity generated a Son from my-  
 “ felf; and know, O man, thy heart gene-  
 “ rates counfel without a wife\*.”

“ God and man,” fays Damafcenus, “ do  
 “ not generate in the fame manner; for  
 “ God being exempt from time, origin,  
 “ paffion, fluxion, or body, and alone with-  
 “ out end, generates without regard to time,  
 “ origin, paffion, or fluxion; fo that this  
 “ incomprehenfible generation has neither  
 “ beginning nor end†.” This paffage is  
 curioufly enlarged upon by Billius, his Com-

\* Ne putares aliquo conjugio indiguiffe Deum, unde  
 filium generaret: eructavit (inquit) cor meum verbum bo-  
 num, id eft, ex me ipfo æternaliter genui filium. Hodie  
 cor tuum, homo, generat confilium: nec quæris uxorem.  
 In Pf. 44. Opera, vol. 2. p. 101.

† Nec eodem modo, Deus et homo gignunt. Deus  
 enim, ut qui temporis, et principii, paffionisque, et fluxi-  
 onis, ac corporis, expers eft, folufque fine careat, ita citra  
 tempus quoque, ac principium, et paffionem, atque fluxi-  
 onem, et fine ullo venereo congressu, gignit; ac nec prin-  
 cipium nec finem habet incomprehenfibilis ipfius generatio.  
 Orthod. Fid. lib. I. cap. 8. p. 260.

mentator\*, The doctrine of the generation of the Son, says Hilary, is much ridiculed, as they say it implies the necessity of a wife to God, &c†.

Another equally troublesome objection to this doctrine of divine generation, was, that there might be no bounds to it. If the Father, they said, can generate a son, the Son also, having the same powers, might generate also, and the Spirit likewise, if he was properly God, and had all the energy of God “If,” says Photius, “the Son be  
“generated from the Father, and the Spirit  
“proceed from the Father and the Son,  
“why should it be peculiar to the Spirit,

\* Gignit igitur assidue pater filium perfectissimum, ut ab æterno genuit, neque ab hujusmodi gignendi officio destitutus est unquam.—Et in hoc manifestum est discrimen generationis hujus divinæ ad humanum quæ finem habet, et tandem ex impotentia cessat, cum ingravescente ætate sterilescent prius fœcundi parentes: sicut in aliis plerisque sigillatim et certa quadam serie in littera digestis, hæc duæ generationes ab in vicem discrepare dignoscuntur. Orthod. Fid. lib. I. cap. 8. p. 264.

† Nam si filius necesse est ut et fœmina sit, et colloquium sermonis, et compunctio conjugalis verbi et blandimentum, et postremum ad generandum naturalis machinula. Contra Constantium, Opera, p. 328.

“that



“ that another should not proceed from  
 “ him \* †” To this he suggests no satisfactory answer.

The Macedonian, in Athanasius, does assign a reason, supposing it not to be in itself impossible, but only improper. “ Both  
 “ the Macedonians, and the orthodox,” says he, “ suppose that the Spirit could have  
 “ generated a son, as well as the Father ;  
 “ but that he did not chuse to do it, lest  
 “ there should be a multiplicity of Gods ‡.”

Notwithstanding all these objections, the importance of this doctrine of the generation of the Son from the Father was thought to be so great, that it was represented as if the very being of the Father himself depended upon it. “ If there had  
 “ been no son,” says Gregory Nyssen,  
 “ there could have been no Father ; if no  
 “ beam, no sun ; if no image, no sub-

\* Εἰ δὲ, εἰ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ υἱὸς γεγενῆσθαι, το δὲ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱὸς ἐκπορεύεται . τίς ἡ καινολομία τοῦ πνεύματος, μὴ καὶ εἶεν τι αὐτὸς ἐκπεπορευεσθαι. Ep. 2. p. 53.

† ΟΡΘ. Εὰν ἐν θελήσει ὁ υἱὸς, τῆς αὐτῆς ὡν φύσεως τῷ πατρί, δύναται γεννησθαι υἱόν . ΜΑΚ. Ναι δύναται ἀλλ’ ἵνα μὴ θεογονίαν διδάχθωμεν τὸ τοῦ εἶναι . Con. Mac. Dial. 1. Opera, vol. 2. p. 273.

“ stance.”

“ stance \*.” Athanasius represents this generation as a necessary consequence from the nature of deity. “ If God,” he says, “ is a fountain, and light, and a father, it cannot be that a fountain should be dry, that light should be without beams, or God without logos; lest he should be without wisdom, without reason, and without light †.”

Cyril of Alexandria also compares the relation of the Son to the Father to that of splendor to the sun, and heat to the fire, both being inseparable, and also coeval. And though the sun, he says, emits splendor, and the fire heat, yet the sun cannot be without its splendor, nor the fire without its heat ‡. But this did not apply to

\* Εἰ ἐν ἐκ ἦν ὁ υἱος, πάντως ἔδε ὁ πατήρ ἦν . εἰ ἐκ ἦν τὸ ἀπαυγασμα, ἔδε τὸ ἀπαυγαῖεν ἦν . εἰ ἐκ ἦν ὁ χαράκηρ, πάντως ἔδε ἡ ὑποστασις ἦν.  
Opera, vol. 2. p. 900.

† Εἰ πηγὴ καὶ φῶς καὶ πατήρ ἐστιν ὁ θεός, καὶ θεμὶς εἰπεῖν ἔλε τὴν πηγὴν ξηραν, ἔλε τὸ φῶς χωρὶς ἀκτίνῃ, ἔλε τὸν θεὸν χωρὶς λόγου, ἵνα μὴ ἀσέφος καὶ ἀλογος καὶ ἀφεγγής ᾖ ὁ θεός. Epist. ad Serapionem, Opera, vol. 1. p. 167.

‡ Nihil enim aliud nomen fontis nobis significat, quam ut ex quo: filius vero in patre et ex patre est non profluens foras,

the Son, or the spirit, for the Father only was considered as *the fountain* of deity.

It was a question even among the Arians, whether God could be called a Father before the creation of Christ \*.

Farther, it was considered as reproachful to the Father, not to be able to generate a son. “The heretics,” says Novatian, “reproach the Father, when they say he could not generate a son, who should be God †.” Epi-

foras, sed aut quasi a sole splendor, aut quasi ab igne infusa sibi caliditas. In his enim exemplis unum ab una produci, et ambo consempiterna sic esse conspiciamus, ut aliud absque alio nec esse possit, nec naturæ suæ rationem retinere. Quomodo enim erit sol, splendore privatus? vel quomodo erit splendor, nisi sol sit a quo defluat? ignis vero quomodo erit calore carens? vel calor unde manabit, nisi ab igne, aut ab alio forsan non procul a substantiali qualitate ignis disjecto? Sicut igitur quæ ab istis profluunt, simul cum illis sunt unde profluunt, ac semper unde fluant ostendunt: sic in unigenito intelligendum est. In Joan. lib. 1. cap. 1. Opera, vol. 1. p. 600.

\* Γηγονῆσαι δὲ καὶ ἐν Ἀρειανοῖς διαίρεσεις, δι’ αἷαν τοιαύτην — ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πεπιστεύεται ὁ θεὸς Πατὴρ εἶναι υἱὸν τῆς λογῆς, ζήτημα ἐνεπέσεν εἰς αἰεὶς, εἰ δυνατόν καὶ πρὸ τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ, ὁ θεὸς καλεῖσθαι Πατὴρ. Socrat. Hist. lib. 5. cap. 23. p. 300.

† Hæc enim contumelia hæreticorum ad ipsum quoque Deum patrem redundabit, si Deus Pater Filium Deum generare non potuit. Cap. 4. p. 32.

phanus thought it reproachful to the unitarians, that they should say that the Father was *γενε*, i. e. unable to generate a son\*.

The orthodox, it must be allowed, took pains enough to do away this reproach; but it was at the risque of exposing their scheme to ridicule, as must have been perceived already. They themselves even proceeded so far as to speak of the *labours* of the Father in generating the Son. For mention is actually made of this circumstance in a serious hymn of Synesius on this subject; the Son being called *κραδισιον τε λοχεισμα*, a *great birth*; Hymn 2. Opera, p. 317. and in Hymn 4. p. 336, there occurs the phrase *ωδινε πατρ*.

Ambrose speaks of the womb of the Father†. What could the heretics, alluded

\* Οὐδ' δε ε λεγει μονον θεον, δια το πηγην ειναι τον πατερα, αλλα μονον θεον, αναμρων οσον το καὶ αυλον την τε υιε δεδιηλα κ̅ υποσασιν, κ̅ τε αγις πνευματι. εχων δε αυλον τον πατερα ενα θεον, αγονον υιε, ως ειναι τα δυο αληθη πατερα κ̅ υιον. τον μεν πατερα αγονον υιε, κ̅ ακαρπον τον λογον δεε ζω̅ος κ̅ σοφιας αληθινης. Hær. 65. Opera, vol. 1. p. 609.

† Sicut enim sinus patris spiritualis intelligitur intimum quoddam paternæ charitatis naturæque secretum, in quo semper est filius, ita etiam patris spiritualis et vulva interioris

to in the following passage of Cyril of Alexandria, have said more? “ Those who  
 “ do not approve of the doctrine, when they  
 “ hear of the Father generating from his  
 “ womb, understand a real womb, and a  
 “ real child-birth \*.”

At length the orthodox learned to be less confident, and more modest on this subject; representing it as a *mysterious* thing, and incapable of any explanation. Indeed, Irenæus expressed his sense of the difficulty of this subject at an early period; but it was in opposition to the Gnostics, who made no difficulty at all of the *prolation* of one incorporeal being from another. “ If  
 “ any person,” says he, “ ask how is the  
 “ Son produced from the Father, we say  
 “ that this production, whether it be called  
 “ generation, or nuncupation, or adaper-

*rioris arcanum, de quo tanquam ex genetali alio processit filius. Denique diverse legimus nunc vulvam patris, nunc cor ejus, quo verbum eructavit. De Benedictionibus Patriarcharum, Opera, vol. i. p. 412.*

\* Hæc qui recte dici negant, quum generare patrem ex utero audiant, uterum, et dolores partus intelligunt. In John, cap. 4. *Opera, vol. i. p. 608.*

“ tion,

“ tion, or by whatever other name this  
 “ ineffable generation be called, no one  
 “ knows ; neither Valentinus, nor Mar-  
 “ cion, nor Saturninus, nor angels, nor  
 “ archangels, nor principalities, nor powers ;  
 “ but the Father only who generated, and  
 “ the Son who was generated \*.”

However, in general, those who followed him complained of no difficulty in this business, as we have seen. Constantine intimates that “ the generation of the Son may

\* Quandoquidem et Dominus, ipse filius Dei, ipsum judicii diem et horam concessit scire solum patrem, manifeste dicens : De die autem illa, et hora nemo scit, neque filius, nisi pater solus. Si igitur scientiam dici illius filius non erubuit referre ad patrem, sed dixit quod verum est ; neque nos erubescimus, quæ sunt in quæstionibus majora secundum nos, reservare Deo. Nemo enim super magistrum est. Si quis itaque nobis dixerit : quomodo ergo filius prolatus a patre est ? dicimus ei, quia prolationem istam, sive generationem, sive nuncupationem sive adaptionem, aut quolibet quis nomine vocaverit generationem ejus inenarrabilem existentem, nemo novit ; non Valentinus, non Marcion, neque Saturninus, neque Basilides, neque angeli, neque archangeli, neque principatus, neque potestates. nisi solus qui generavit pater, et qui natus est filius. Lib. 2. cap. 48. p. 176.

“ be

“ be understood by those who are beloved  
 “ of God \*.”

Considering the time in which Novatian wrote, it is rather extraordinary that he should express himself with so much modesty as he does. “ The Son,” says he, “ is  
 “ not a mere sound, or voice, but the substance of the power of God prolated;  
 “ with which sacred and divine nativity,  
 “ neither the apostles, nor prophets, nor the  
 “ angels, were acquainted; but the Father  
 “ and the Son only †.”

We do not wonder at this modesty in later times, when the orthodox had been long teized with objections, to which they had not been able to make any satisfactory answer. Phæbadius says, “ the Father generated the Son, but no one knows

\* *Αλλά τη γενεσιν διπλὴν τινα νοεῖσθαι χρῆ, τὴν μὲν ἐξ ἀποκρυψεως, τὴν συνεγνωσμενὴν ταύτην. Ἐλεραν δὲ τὴν ἐξ αἰδὸς αἰτίας, ἢ τοῦ λόγου θεοῦ προνοεῖα θεᾶται, καὶ ἀνδρῶν οὐ ἐκείνῳ φίλος ὑπάρχει.* Oratio, cap. 11. p. 688.

† Qui non in sono percussæ æris, aut tono coactæ de visceribus vocis accipitur; sed in substantia prolatae a Deo virtutis agnoscitur; cujus sacræ et divinæ nativitatis arcana nec apostolus didicit, nec prophetae comperit, nec angelus scivit, nec creatura cognovit, Filio soli nota sunt, qui patris secreta cognovit. Cap. 31. p. 120.

“ from

“from whence\* ;” meaning, probably, from what part of himself ; for that the Son was generated from the substance of the Father, was never doubted by those who were reckoned orthodox. At present this generation is esteemed to be as great a mystery as any other circumstance relating to the trinity. But this only cuts off all defence of it, and is by no means any answer to the objections made to it.

---

## SECTION IV.

*Whether the Generation of the Son was in Time,  
and also whether it was a voluntary or in-  
voluntary Act of the Father.*

**A**DMITTING this mysterious generation, and supposing all objections removed, there still remain two questions to be considered, viz. at what *time* did this event take place ; and was this generation on the part of the Father *voluntary*, or *involuntary*.

\* Genuit quidem filium Pater, sed nemo scit unde. Bib. Pat. vol. 5. p. 266.

With



With respect to these questions, all the early Fathers, indeed, all before the council of Nice, say that the Son was generated *in time*, that there was a time when God was without a Son ; and that this generation took place immediately before the creation, in order to the Son's being instrumental in it. Of course, they either expressly said, or must have supposed, that the generation of the Son was *voluntary*, so that the Father might have chosen to be without a Son. But in a more advanced state of orthodoxy, after the council of Nice, these opinions were considered as very exceptionable and heretical. The language then was, that God was *always a Father*, in the proper sense of the word, as there had always been a Son ; and though they did not chuse to say that God did any thing *necessarily*, yet they scrupled not to intimate, in less offensive expressions, that it was so in fact. I shall produce a variety of passages from the Fathers in proof of these assertions, and shall dispose them nearly in the order of time, that the above-men-

tioned change in their language and sentiments may be more easily perceived.

Tatian represents the Father as “having  
“ been alone before the creation of the  
“ world, that every thing was in him,  
“ by the power of the logos, and the logos  
“ itself; that at his will the logos came  
“ out of him, who was a simple being, and  
“ became the first production of his Spirit.  
“ This logos,” he says, “ was the *αρχη* to  
“ the external world,” or the source from  
which it proceeded\*.

Theophilus says, “ John says, In the be-  
“ ginning was the word, and the word was  
“ with God, shewing that at first God  
“ was alone, and the logos in him †.”

\* Ο γὰρ δεσπότης των ολων αυτος υπαρχων τῃ παντις η υποστασις, καλα μεν την μηδεπω γεγενημενην ποιησιν μονος ην· καὶ ο δε πασα δυναμις, ορατων τε κ' αορατων αυτος υποστασις ην, συν αυτω παντα . συν αυτω γὰρ δια λογικης δυναμεως, αυτος κ' ο λογος, ος ην εν αυτω, υπεστη . Δεληματι δε της απλοτητος αυτης προπηδα λογος· ο δε λογος κ' καλα κενεω χωρησας, εργον πρωτοτοκον τῃ πνευματις γινεται . τελον ισμεν τῃ κοσμῳ την αρχην . Ad Græcos, sect. 7. p. 20.

† Εξ ων Ιωαννης λεγει· εν αρχη ην ο λογος, κ' ο λογος ην προς τον Θεον· δεικνυς οτι εν πρωτοις μονος ην ο Θεος, κ' εν αυτω ο λογος . Lib. 3. p. 30.

Clemens

Clemens Alexandrinus evidently supposed that there was a time before either the world or the Son existed; for, he says, “He shewed that he was righteous by the logos from of old, from the time that he became a Father; for he was God before he was a creator, and he was good; and on this account he chose to be a creator, and a Father\*.” In another passage, speaking of the logos as equal to God, calling him “the divine logos, God most manifest, made equal to the Lord of all, and before the sun, as being his Son, and the logos that was in God,” he speaks of him as “deriving his origin from the will of the Father†.” He says that “the logos was before Lucifer‡.” “Do you en-

\* Το δίκαιον δὲ ἡμῖν διὰ τὰ λόγῳ ἐνδείκνυσθαι τὰ εἶναι. ἐκεῖθεν ἀνωθεν, ὁθεν γεγόνε πατήρ. πρὶν γὰρ κτίσθην γενεσθαι, θεὸς ἦν, ἀγαθὸς ἦν, καὶ διὰ τούτου καὶ δημιουργὸς εἶναι καὶ πατήρ ἠθέλησεν. Ped. lib. i. cap. 9. p. 127.

† Ο θεὸς λόγος, ὁ φανερωτὰς οὐλῶς θεός, ὁ τῷ δεσποτῇ τῶν ὅλων ἐξιστῶν. οἱ ἦν υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν ἐν τῷ θεῷ.—Ταχιστα δὲ εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους διαδοθεὶς, θάπτον ἦλκε ἐξ αὐτῆς ἀνάλειπας τῆς παλαιοῦς βλαήσεως, ῥατὰ ἡμῖν ἐπελαμψε τὸν θεόν. Ad Gentes, p. 68.

‡ Πρὸ ἐωσφορε γὰρ ἦν, καὶ ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν καὶ θεός ἦν ὁ λόγος. Ibid. p. 5.

“ quire about the generation of the logos,” says Hippolitus, “ God the Father generated “ whom he pleased, and as he pleased\*.” “ We believe,” says Athanasius, “ that God “ generated him spontaneously, and voluntarily †.”

Tertullian expressly says, that “ God was “ not always a Father or a judge ; since he “ could not be a Father before he had a “ Son, nor a judge before there was sin ; “ and there was a time when both sin “ and the Son, which made God to be a “ judge and a Father, were not ‡.” The same is also implied in the following passage, “ At first, before the Son made his “ appearance, God said, let there be light,

\* Περι δε λογος γενεσιν ζηεις, ουπερ βεληθεις ο θεος πατηρ εγεννησεν ως ηδελυσεν. In Noetum, sect. 16. Opera, p. 18.

† Αυτοκρατορα γαρ ημεις τον θεον κ̅ Κυριον αυτον εαυτη ειδοτες, εκσταως αυτον κ̅ εδελονην υιον γεγεννημεναι ευσεβως υπειληφμεν. De Syn. Arim. Opera, vol. 1. p. 898.

‡ Quia et pater Deus est, et judex Deus est, non tamen ideo pater et judex semper. Nam nec pater potuit esse ante filium, nec judex ante delictum, Fuit autem tempus cum et delictum et filius non fuit quod judicem et qui patrem Dominum fecerit. Ad Hermogenem, cap. 3. Opera, p. 234.

“ and

“ and there was light ; the word itself was  
 “ immediately the true light ; for from  
 “ that time Christ the word assisted, and  
 “ administered. God would that things  
 “ should be, and God made them\*.” But  
 the following passage is perhaps still more  
 express. “ If that,” says he, “ which was  
 “ in God, and came out of God, was not  
 “ without a beginning, viz. *wisdom*, which  
 “ was produced from the time that God  
 “ determined to make the world, much  
 “ more must things that are *without God*  
 “ have a beginning†.”

“ Christ,” says Novatian, “ is always in  
 “ the Father, lest he should not always be  
 “ a Father ; but the Father must in some

\* Primum quidem, nondum filio apparente, et dixit Deus, fiat lux, et facta est : ipse statim sermo lux vera, quæ illuminat hominem venientem in hunc mundum, et per illum mundialis quoque lux. Exinde autem in sermone Christo assistente, et administrante, Deus voluerit fieri, et Deus fecit. Ad Praxeam, sect. 12. Opera, p. 506.

† Si enim intra dominum quod ex ipso, et in ipso fuit, sine initio non fuit, sophia scilicet ipsius, exinde nata et condita, ex quo in sensu Dei ad opera mundi disponenda cæpit agitari, multo magis, non capit sine initio quicquam fuisse quod extra dominum fuerit. Ad Hermogenem, sect.

“ sense precede him ; for he is prior as  
 “ Father. For in some way it is necessary  
 “ that he who has no origin precede him  
 “ who has an origin. He, therefore, when  
 “ the Father would, proceeded out of the  
 “ Father, and he who was in the Father,  
 “ came out of him \*.” Again, he says,  
 “ nothing was before Christ, but the Fa-  
 “ ther † ;” and in another place, he says,  
 “ from whom,” [viz. God] “ and when he  
 “ chose, the Son, the word, was generated ‡.”

“ God,” says Lactantius, “ the framer  
 “ and ordainer of all things, before he un-

\* Semper enim in patre ; ne pater non semper sit pater : quin et pater illum etiam quadam ratione præcedit, quod necesse est quadammodo prior sit qua pater sit. Quoniam aliquo pacto antecedit necesse est, eum qui habet originem ille qui originem nescit. Hic ergo quando pater voluit, processit ex patre : et qui in patre fuit, processit ex patre. Cap. 31. p. 121.

† Ante quem nihil præter Patrem. Cap. 11. p. 32.

‡ Est ergo Deus pater omnium institutor et creator solus originem nesciens, invisibilis, immensus, immortalis, æternus, unus Deus, cujus neque magnitudini, neque majestati neque virtuti quicquam non dixerim præferri, sed nec comparari potest. Ex quo, quando ipse voluit, sermo filius natus est. Cap. 31. p. 120:

“ dertook

“dertook the construction of this world,  
“generated an incorruptible spirit, which  
“he called his Son\*.”

Eusebius, speaking of God intending to form the material world, as well as angels, and the souls of men, says “he thought of  
“making one to govern and direct the  
“whole,” and then he proceeds to describe the generation of the Son, as being “the  
“proper wisdom of the Father†.” In the same work he says, “light is emitted necessarily from the sun; but the Son became the image of the Father from  
“his knowledge and intention, and when

\* Deus igitur machinator, constitutorque rerum, ante quam præclarum hoc opus mundi adoriretur, sanctum, incorruptibilem spiritum genuit, quem filium nuncuparet. Instit. lib. 4. sect. 6. p. 364.

† Πρόλαβων το μέλλον, οἱ θεοί, τὴ προγνώσει, συνιδὼν τε, τελῶν ἀπαντῶν περὶ γενέσεως ἐν μεγάλῳ σώματι κεφαλὴν δεησομένων.—Βεληθεὶς γὰρ ὁ θεός, ἀλειμονός, ὡς ἀγαθός, ἀγαθὸς τε πάντις ἀρχὴ καὶ πηγὴ, τῶν αὐτῆς θεσφαυρῶν πλείους ἀποφθίνει κοινῶντες· ἀρξὴ τε μέλλον τὴν λογικὴν πᾶσαν προβάλλεσθαι κλίσιν, ἀσωματὲς τινὰς νοεράς καὶ θείας δύναμεις, ἀγγέλους τε καὶ ἀρχαγγέλους, αὐτὰ τε καὶ πάντῃ καθάρᾳ πνευμαία, προσεῖν δὲ ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων.—Ἐνὰ τὸν τῆς δημιουργείας ἀπάσης οἰκονομὸν ἡγεμόνα τε καὶ βασιλεῖα τῶν ὄλων προλάξασθαι ὡς δὲ δεῖν. Demonstratio, lib. 4. cap. 1. p. 145.

“ he pleased, he became the Father of a  
 “ Son \*.”

It was thought by some of the ancients, as Beaufobre says (*Histoire de Manichéisme*, vol. 1. p. 264) that angels were made before the visible world, and that Satan was their prince. The Son, therefore, being generated immediately before the visible world, must have been posterior to Satan; and upon this idea, Athanasius, in the dialogue which he is supposed to have had with Arius, observes, that if he worshipped *the first of creatures*, he must worship Satan. That Satan was the first of creatures, was inferred from Job xl. 19. where it is said of *Behemoth* (which was thought to represent Satan) that he is the chief of the works of God, in the Septuagint, ἀρχῇ, the beginning\*.

\* Ἡ μὲν αὐγὴ καὶ κατὰ προαιρεσὶν τὰ φῶς ἐκλαμπει, καὶ τι δὲ τῆς ὕσεως συμβεβηκός ἀχωριστον. Ὁ δὲ υἱὸς κατὰ γινωμὴν καὶ προαιρεσὶν εἰκὼν ὑπερῆ τὸ πάρος. βεβηθεὶς γὰρ ὁ θεὸς γεγενεν υἱὸν πάληρ. *Demonstratio*, lib. 4. cap. 3. p. 148.

\* Ὁ θεὸς τῷ Ἰωβ χρηματίζων, εἰως εἶπε περὶ τῆς σάλιν, τέλει τῆς ἀρχῆς πλάσματος κυρίᾳ πεποιημένη ἐμπαιζέσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων μὲν. σὺ ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ ποιήματι προσκυνῶν, τὸν σάταναν προσκυνεῖς, καθὼς  
 παρρησησεν



We are now advanced as far as the council of Nice, without finding any other opinion than that of the Father generating the Son *voluntarily*, and *in time*; but now we come to a stricter kind of orthodoxy, and between them we find some little inconsistency in what Hilary has advanced on this subject.

In some passages he seems to be clearly of the opinion of those who went before him. Thus he says, “God the Father is the  
“ cause of all, being absolutely without be-  
“ ginning, and alone. The Son was pro-  
“ duced by the Father before all time, be-  
“ ing created and founded before the ages.  
“ He was not before he was generated; but  
“ being generated before time, and before  
“ all things. He alone subsisted from the  
“ Father alone. He is neither eternal nor  
“ co-eternal—for God is before the Son,  
“ as we learned of thee, O Pope,” to whom his work is addressed, “preaching in full

παρεστητεν ο λογος . εαν δε σοφισασθαι βεληταιας, οτι τε υις προΐερον  
ποιημα εστιν ο σαλυναις, αρα προσβύλερον αυτον ποιης τε αγιε πνευματος.  
Opera, vol. 2. p. 120.

“ congre-

“ congregation.” Again, he says, “ He is  
 “ his chief, as his God, since he is before  
 “ him\*.” “ I do not know,” says he,  
 “ when the Son was generated; but it  
 “ would be wickedness in me to be igno-  
 “ rant that he was generated †.”

That Hilary did express this opinion is evident from Austin’s censuring him for ascribing eternity to the Father only ‡; and

\* Et quidem Deus pater causa est omnium, omnino sine initio solitarius: Filius autem sine tempore editus est a patre, et ante secula creatus et fundatus. Non erat antequam nasceretur: sed sine tempore ante omnia natus, solus a solo patre subsistit. Nec enim est æternus, aut co-æternus, aut simul non factus cum patre, nec simul cum patre habet esse, sicuti quidam dicunt, aut aliqui duo non nata principia introducentes, sed sicut unio est principium omnium, sic et Deus ante omnia est. Propter quod et ante filium est, sicut et a te didicimus, papa, media in ecclesia prædicante. Principatur autem ei, utpote Deus ejus, cum sit ante ipsum. Lib. 4. p. 60. 101.

† Nescio enim quando natus sit filius, et nefas est mihi nescire quod natus sit. Lib. 2. p. 27.

‡ Et quia non mediocris auctoritatis in tractatione scripturarum, et assertionem fidei vir exitit, Hilarius enim hoc in libris suis posuit, horum verborum, id est, patris et imaginis et muneris; æternitatis et speciei et usus, abditam scrutatus intelligentiam quantum valeo non eum secutum arbitror

yet in other passages of this work Hilary holds a different language, “Where there  
 “is always a Father,” he says, “there is  
 “always a Son\*.” “You think it, O he-  
 “retic, pious and religious to say that God  
 “always was, but that the Father was not  
 “always†.” Again, he says, “to deny  
 “the eternity of Christ is a sin against the  
 “Holy Spirit‡.”

This inconsistency in Hilary may perhaps be explained by the following maxims of his, viz. “That is eternal which is before  
 “time§.” By thus making that to be

arbitror in æternitatis vocabulo, nisi quod pater non habet patrem de quo fit, filius autem de patre est ut fit, atque ut illi co-æternus sit. De Trinitate, lib. 6. cap. 9. Opera, vol. 3. p. 332.

\* Ubi autem semper pater est, semper et filius est. Lib. 12. p. 305.

† Pium tibi ac religiosum, hæretice, existimas, Deum semper quidem, sed non semper patrem confiteri? Ibid. p. 309.

‡ Peccatum autem in spiritum est, Deo virtutis potestatem negare, et Christo substantiam adimere æternitatis. In Matt. Opera, p. 519.

§ Æternum autem est, quicquid tempus excedit. Lib. 12. p. 307.

eternal

eternal which preceded the creation, when time was supposed to commence, he might say that the generation of Christ was from eternity, and yet mean that he had not always been generated.

After this time the opinion of the catholic christians was invariably in favour of a proper *eternal generation*; and in this they were assisted by the genuine principles of Platonism; according to which the creation, and consequently the *nous* or *logos*, its immediate author, was from eternity. Till this time the Platonizing christians had only held so much of Platonism as they had been able to retain consistently with the universally received doctrines of revelation, one of which was supposed to be that there was a time before God made the world, or had a Son. They were, therefore, obliged to hold that there was a time when the Father was *alone*, the Son having no existence, but as the reason of the Father. But as, in the course of this controversy, the personal dignity of Christ advanced, which it uniformly did, they came to think with the  
Platonists,

Platonists, that the *logos* might have been from eternity, though the *creation* had not. They then argued as the Platonists had done, that the *effect* (and such they never scrupled to call Christ) might always have co-existed with its *cause*. When it was objected that, “if the Son and Spirit be “eternal, they must be without cause, “like the Father.” Gregory Nazianzen replies, “that effects are sometimes cotemporary with their causes, as is the case “with the sun and his light\*.”

The difficulty about *involuntary generation* was not got over so well as that relating to its taking place before all time.

“The Father,” says Austin, “generated “the Son neither necessarily, nor voluntarily, because there is no necessity in “God. The will cannot be before wisdom, which is the Son.” He then asks, “Do you, O heretic, say whether the Father “existed necessarily, or voluntarily\*.”

\* Δηλον δε το αἰον ὡς ἡ παντως—πρεσβυτερον των ὧν εἰν αἰον, ἡδε γαρ τε φῶς ηλως. Or. 35. Opera, p. 563.

\* Voluntate genuit pater filium, an necessitate? Nec voluntate, nec necessitate: quia necessitas in Deo non est: præire

Chrysostom, after representing *eruētation* as an involuntary thing, descants upon God's eruētating a good logos. "It was not the stomach," he says, "but the heart; and what did he eruētate? not meat or drink, but the good logos, his only begotten †." Cyril of Alexandria seems to say, that Christ, being the will of the Father, it is absurd to ask whether he was generated voluntarily, or involuntarily ‡.

In a creed drawn up by the bishops in the east, and sent to those in the west (in which the Arian doctrines of the creation of the Son out of nothing, and of there ever having been a time when he was not, are condemned, the opinion that the Father did not

*præire autem voluntas sapientiam non potest, quod est filius: igitur prius est rationabiliter sapere, quam rationabiliter velle. Dic, inquit, et tu hæretice, Deus pater necessitate est Deus, an voluntate? Quest. 65. Opera, vol. 4. p. 678.*

† Ουχ ο σωμαχος ο ται σίλια δεχομενος, αλλ' η καρδια. εξηρευξαλο γαρ φησιν, η καρδια μω. κ' τι ερευγεται· ο σίλον εδε ποιον, αλλα τα συλγεται τη τραπεζη, λογον αγαθον, του περι τω μονογενεω. In Pf. 44. Opera, vol. 3. p. 207.

‡ De Trinitate, lib. 2. vol. 2. p. 384.

generate

generate the Son of his free will and choice is likewise condemned \*. The same doctrine is asserted in another of those oriental creeds, in which it is said, “ If any one  
 “ shall say that the Son was not generated  
 “ at the will of the Father, let him be  
 “ anathema †.”

I must not conclude this subject without mentioning the opinion of Origen, viz. that there is no time with respect to God ; and, therefore, that it must be impossible to determine when the Son was generated. He says, that “ there is no evening or  
 “ morning with God, but time of the same  
 “ extent with his eternal life. This is the  
 “ day in which the Son is generated, the  
 “ beginning of his birth, and the day of his

\* Τες δε λεγοντας εξ εκ ουλων τον υιον, η εξ ελερας υποστασεως, κ' μη εκ τε θεου, κ' ολι ην ποτε χρονος η αιων οτε μη ην, αλλοις οιδεν η αγια καθολικη εκκλησια. ομοιως κ' τες λεγοντας τρεις ειναι θεους, η τον χριστον μη ειναι θεον προ των αιωνων, μητε χριστον μητε υιον θεου ειναι αυτον, η τον αυτον ειναι Πατερα κ' Υιον κ' αγιον Πνευμα, κ' αγεννητον τον υιον, η ολι ε βελησει οδε δελησει εγεννησεν ο πατηρ τον υιον, αναθεματιζει η αγια κ' καθολικη εκκλησια. Socratis Hist. lib. 2. cap. 19. p. 99.

† Ει τις μη δελησαι<sup>ν</sup> τε πατρος γεγεννησθαι τον υιον λεγοι, αναθεμα εγω. Ibid. lib. 2. cap. 30. p. 126.

“ being

“being founded \*.” But it does not appear that any person in his time, or for many years after, supposed that the Son had existed always, except as the reason of the eternal Father, an attribute belonging to him, and not separated from him. Austin also supposes that there was no time before the creation †.

According to Plato himself, time cannot be predicated of what is eternal; so that it cannot be said of God that *he was*, or that *he will be*, but only that *he is* ‡. He also says that time was made with the heavens §.

\* Ω αει εστι το σημερον, εκ εις γαρ εσπερα δεξ. εγω δε ηγεμαι δι εδε πρωια, λλ' ο συμπαρακλειων τη αγεννητω κ' αιδιω αυτω ζωη, ιν ειως ειπω, χρονος, ημεραι εστιν αυτω σημερον, ει η γεγεννηται ο υιος. Αρχης γενεσεως αυτω ειως οχι ευρισκομενης, ως οδε της ημερας. Comment. vol. 2. p. 31.

† Quæ tempora fuissent quæ abs te non condita essent. Confess. Q. 11. vol. 1. p. 190.

‡ Ταυτα δε παντα μερος χρονου, κ', το, τ' ην, το, τ' εσαι, χρονου γεγονυτος ειδη. φερουτες λανθανομεν επι την αιδιον εσιν, εκ ορθως. λεγομεν γαρ δη ως ην, εστι τε κ' εσαι. τη δε το εστι μονον, καλα τον αληθη λογον, προσηκει. το δε ην, το, τ' εσαι, περι την εν χρονωγενεσιν ιεσαν ωρεπει λεγεσθαι. Timæus, p. 711. Ad Genevæ.

§ Χρονος δ' εν μετ' εραν γεγενεν, ινα αμα γεννηθεντες, αμα κ' λυθωσιν, αν ποτε λυσις τις αυτων γενηται. Ibid. p. 529.



## C H A P T E R IV.

*The Inferiority of the Son to the Father, shown to have been the Doctrine of all the Antenicene Fathers.*

IT is remarkable that, though all the Antenicene Fathers were of opinion that the Son derived his being from the *substance of the Father*, and before his generation was even his own proper *wisdom, power*, and all his other essential attributes, they uniformly asserted, that he was *inferior to the Father*, and subject to him. This was certainly unnatural, and a real inconsistency. For, admitting the Son to have been what they represented him, he was, to say the least, fully equal to every thing that could constitute the Father. Indeed, taking from the Father all that they say had constituted the Son, there was nothing of any value left to belong to himself.

Admitting their absurd notion, that, after the generation of such a Son (to constitute whom, all his own essential attributes,

in their fullest extent, contributed) the Father was not really diminished, but left in all respects the same as if no such communication of his powers had been made; yet as he could not be greater, or more excellent than he had been, and the Son had all the perfections that the Father had ever been possessed of, these writers would naturally have been led to maintain the perfect equality of the Son to the Father, as they actually did some time afterwards. Their not doing this, therefore, for some centuries, clearly discovers that these philosophizing christians were in very different situations at the two different times, with respect to their fellow christians, and the opinions that were generally entertained by them.

This remarkable fact cannot, I think, be accounted for, but upon the supposition, that, while they hesitated to pursue their principle to its proper extent, they were restrained by the fear of *popular prejudices*, which would not have borne the doctrine of the equality of the Son to the Father. Or, notwithstanding the tendency of the new doctrine, the force of habit was such, that  
they

they could not bring themselves at once to change the language, and the ideas to which they and their ancestors had been long accustomed. Now the circumstance which so long restrained the natural operation of this new doctrine of the generation of the Son from the substance of the Father, and of his very *being* consisting of the essential attributes of the Father, could be nothing else but the established doctrine of *one God*, of unrivalled majesty and power, whose servant Christ, as well as all the preceding prophets, had always been considered. It is evident, from numberless passages in their writings, that they were afraid lest the new doctrines of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ should give offence to the common people, who were for a long time generally unitarians. This hypothesis only can well account for these writers so fully and so frequently expressing their belief of the inferiority of the Son to the Father.

As, in this view, the language they hold on this subject is an article of considerable importance, shewing us their real situation

and feelings, I shall produce a considerable number of passages from the Antenicene Fathers, in which their opinion of the inferiority of the Son to the Father is clearly expressed, and it would have been very easy to have doubled the number.

I lay but little stress on any passage in the writings of those who are called *apostolical Fathers*, or the epistles of Ignatius, for reasons that have been given in my Introduction; but as the composition of them, or the interpolations in them, were made in a pretty early age, I shall select a few of them. They shew that the idea of the inferiority of the Son to the Father was not given up when those works were composed.

Hermas, speaking of a vineyard let out by its owner, who had many servants, to his son, when he took a journey, says, “ The owner of the estate represents the  
“ Father, the creator of all things ; his  
“ servant, the son of God ; and the vine-  
“ yard, which he keeps, the people,” And, giving a reason why the son is placed in a servile condition, he says, “ it is not a  
service,

“ service, but a place of great power ; for  
 “ that he is the Lord of the people, having  
 “ received all power from the Father \*.”  
 This is not the manner in which an ortho-  
 dox christian would have expressed himself  
 on the subject.

Ignatius commends the Ephesians for  
 their harmony ; saying, that “ they were  
 “ so joined, as the church to Christ, and  
 “ Christ to the Father ; that every thing  
 “ might be in perfect harmony †.” “ Be  
 “ subject to the bishop, and to one another,  
 “ as Jesus Christ was to the Father (ac-  
 “ cording to the flesh) and the apostles to  
 “ Christ, the Father, and the Spirit ‡. Be

\* Dominus autem fundi demonstratur esse is qui crea-  
 vit cuncta et consummavit, et virtutem illis dedit, servus  
 vero illi filius dei est. Vineam autem populus est, quem  
 servat ipse — In servili conditione non ponitur filius  
 dei, sed in magna potestate et imperio — Vides igitur  
 esse dominum populi, accepta a patre suo omni potestate.  
 Lib. 3. cap. 5, 6. p. 105.

† Ποσω πολλων υμας μακαριζω τες εγκεκραμενες ελως, ως εκκλησια  
 Ιησu χριστω, κ̅ ο Ιησuς χρισ̅ τω πατρι, ινα παντα εν ενοη̅ι η. Ad  
 Ep. sect. 5. p. 13.

‡ Υποταγη̅τε τω επισκοπω κ̅ αλληλοις, ως Ιησuς χρισ̅ τω πατρι  
 κα̅α σαρκ̅α, κ̅ οι αποστολοι τω χρισ̅ω κ̅ τω πατρι κ̅ τω πνευματι, ινα  
 ενω̅σις η σαρκικη τε κ̅ πνευματικη. Ad Mag. sect. 13. p. 21.

“ ye imitators of Christ, as he is of the Fa-  
 “ ther\*. As our Lord did nothing with-  
 “ out the Father, being united to him;  
 “ neither by himself, nor by his apostles,  
 “ so do you nothing without the bishop,  
 “ and the elders†.” This language favours  
 of primitive antiquity, and makes me in-  
 clined to think that the epistles are not  
 altogether forged, but rather interpolated.  
 At least they must have been forged in an  
 early age.

Justin Martyr, who insists so much on  
 the pre-existence and divinity of Christ,  
 speaking of the logos, says, “ than whom  
 “ we know no prince more kingly, and  
 “ more righteous, after the God who gene-  
 “ rated him‡.” Speaking of the God in  
 heaven, and the God upon earth, who con-  
 versed with Abraham, he says, “ The for-  
 “ mer is the Lord of that Lord who was

\* Μιμηταί γινεσθε Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ὡς καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ. Ad  
 Philad. sect 7. p. 32.

† Ὡςπερ ἐν ὁ κυριὸς ἀνευ τοῦ πατρὸς ἔδεν ἐποίησε, ἠνωμένος ὢν, εἴτε  
 δι’ αὐτοῦ, εἴτε διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων· εἴως μὴδὲ ὑμεῖς ἀνευ τοῦ ἐπισκοποῦ, καὶ  
 τῶν πρεσβυτέρων μηδὲν πράσσετε. Ad. Mag. sect. 7. p. 19.

‡ Οὐ βασιλικῶτατον καὶ δικαιοτάτον ἀρχοντα, μᾶλλον τοῦ γεννησαύτου θεοῦ,  
 ἐδέναι οὐδ’ ἄνθρωπον οὐτά. Apol. 1. p. 17.

“ upon

“ upon earth, as his Father, and God, the  
 “ cause of his existence, and of his being  
 “ powerful, and Lord, and God \*.” Nei-  
 “ ther Abraham, Isaac, nor Jacob,” he says,  
 “ nor any man, ever saw the Father, and  
 “ ineffable Lord of all, and of Christ him-  
 “ self; but he who by his will was God,  
 “ his Son, and an angel, from his being sub-  
 “ servient to his will, who at his pleasure  
 “ was made a man, from the virgin, who  
 “ also in the form of fire appeared to Moses  
 “ in the bush †.”

“ I will endeavour to convince you who  
 “ know the scriptures, that there is another  
 “ who is called God and Lord, besides him  
 “ that made all things, who is also called  
 “ an angel, on account of his delivering to  
 “ man whatever he who is the maker of all

\* Ος κ' ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κυρίῳ κυρίως ἐστίν, ὡς πατήρ κ' θεός, αὐτός τε αὐτῷ τε εἶναι, κ' δυνατῷ, κ' κυρίῳ, κ' θεῷ. Dial. p. 413.

\* Οὐτε ἐν Ἀβραάμ, ἔτε Ἰσαάκ, ἔτε Ἰακώβ, ἔτε ἄλλος ἀνθρώπων εἶδε τον πατέρα κ' ἀρρητον κυριον των παντων απλως, κ' αὐτῆς τε χρίσε, ἀλλ' ἐκείνον τον κατὰ βελην την ἐκείνης κ' θεον οντα, υιον αὐτῆς, κ' ἀγγελον ἐκ τῆς υπηρετεῖν τῇ γνώμῃ αὐτῆς, ον κ' ἀνθρώπον γεννηθεναι διὰ τῆς παρθενῆς βεβηληται, ος κ' πῦρ ὡς ποτε γεγονε τῇ πρὸς Μοῦσα ομιλῇ ἀπο τῆς βατῆς. Dial. p. 411.

“ things, and above whom there is no other  
 “ God, wills that he should deliver \*.”

Though Christ was supposed by this writer to have made all things, yet there was a sense in which the phrase, *maker of all things* (ο ποιητης των παντων) was thought to be applicable to the Father only. “ I will  
 “ endeavour,” says he, “ to shew that he  
 “ who appeared to Abraham, Jacob, and  
 “ Moses, and who is called God, is diffe-  
 “ rent from the God that made all things,  
 “ &c.—I say that he never did any thing  
 “ but what that God who made all things,  
 “ and above whom there is no god, willed  
 “ that he should do or say †.” With a

\* Α λεγω πειρασομαι υμας πεισαι, νοησαντας τας γραφας, οτι εστι  
 η λεγεται θεος η χυρις ετερη [υπερ] τον ποιητην των ολων, ος η  
 αγγελος καλειται, δια το αγγελειν τοις ανθρωποις οσαπερ βελται αυ-  
 τοις αγγειλαι ο των ολων ποιητης, υπερ ον αλλη θεος εκ εστι. It is ac-  
 knowledged that this υπερ should be παρα, or υπο. Dial. I.  
 p. 249.

† Πειρασομαι πεισαι υμας οτι εστις ο τε τω Αβρααμ η τω Ιακωβ η τω  
 Μωσει ωφθαι λεγομενη η γεγραμμενος θεος ελεος εστι τε τα παντα  
 ποιησαντη θεο· αριθμω λεγω αλλ' ε τη γνωμη. Ουδεν γαρ φημι  
 αυτον απεπραχεναι ποτε η απερ αυτος ο τον κοσμον ποιησας. υπερ ον  
 αλλος εκ εστι θεος, βεβαληται, και πρᾶξαι και μιμηται. Dial. I.  
 p. 252.



view to this Origen calls Christ the *immediate maker* of the world\*.

Athenagoras did not consider Christ as *the one God*, but one who was employed by the one God. “Our doctrine,” he says, “teaches us, that there is one God, the maker of all things—who made all things by his own *logos* †.”

Clemens Alexandrinus calls the *logos* “the image of God, the legitimate son of his mind; a light, the copy of the light, and man the image of the *logos* ‡.” He calls the Father the only true God. Alluding to the heathen mysteries, he says, “Be thou initiated, and join the chorus with the angels about him who is the unbegotten and immortal, the only true God, God the *logos* joining with us, he being always the one Jesus, the great high priest of the one God, and his

\* Τον προτεχως δημιουργον. Contra Celsum, lib. 6. p. 317.

† Επει δε ο λογος ημων εναι θεον αγει τον τεδε τε παντος ποιητην, αυτον μεν ε γενομενον (οτι το ου ε γινεσκει αλλα το μη ου) παντα δε δια τε πατρ αυτου λογεσ πεποιημενα. Apol. p. 40.

‡ Ημεν γαρ τε θεσ ειπων, ο λογος αυτου. Και υιος τε νε γινισθη, ο θειος λογος, φωτος αρχιλυπεν φως. Εικαν δε τε λογε, ο αυδρατες. Ad Gentes, p. 62.

“ Father ; he prays for men, and gives  
 “ laws to men \*.” He speaks of Christ  
 as “ subservient to his Father’s will, and  
 “ only called God by way of figure †.  
 “ The mediator,” he says, “ performs the  
 “ will of the Father. The logos is the  
 “ mediator, being common to both, the  
 “ seal of God, and the Saviour of men.  
 “ Of the one he is the servant, but our  
 “ instructor ‡.” “ There is one unbe-  
 “ gotten almighty Father, and one first  
 “ begotten, by whom all things were, and  
 “ without whom nothing was made. For  
 “ one is truly God, who made the αρχη [the  
 “ origin] of all things, meaning his first  
 “ begotten Son ||.” And yet this writer

\* Εἰ βέλαι, καὶ συ μὲν, καὶ χορεύσεις μετ’ ἀγγέλων ἀμφὶ τοῦ ἀγεννητοῦ  
 καὶ ἀνώλεθρον καὶ μόνον οὕτως θεόν, συνυμνεύει ἡμῖν τε θεὸς λόγος. Αἰδὸς  
 ἰός, Ἰησὺς εἰς, ὁ μέγας ἀρχιερεὺς θεὸς τε ἐνὸς τε αὐτὸς καὶ πατήρ, ὑπερ  
 ἑνδρωπῶν εὐχέλαι, καὶ ἀνδρωποῖς ἐγμελευεῖται. *Ad Gentes*, p. 74.

† Θεὸς ἐν ἀνδρῶπι σχημαῖ. ἀχραντός, πατρικῶς θελήματι διακονός,  
 λόγος, θεός, ὁ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, ὁ ἐμ δεξιῶν τε πατήρ, συν καὶ τῷ σχηματι θεός.  
*Ibid.* p. 80.

‡ Καὶ τὸ θελήμα τε πατήρ ὁ μεσίτης ἐκτελεῖ. μεσίτης γὰρ ὁ λόγος,  
 ὁ κοινὸς ἀμφοῖν. Θεὸν μὲν υἱός, σῶτηρ δὲ ἀνδρωπῶν. Καὶ τε μὲν δια-  
 κόνος, ἡμῶν δὲ, παιδαγωγός. *Pædag. lib. 3. cap. 1. p. 215.*

|| Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐγ μὲν τὸ ἀγεννητόν, παλινοκράτωρ θεός· ἐν δὲ καὶ τὸ προ-  
 γεννηθέν, διὰ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἐν· εἰς γὰρ

had represented the *logos* as equal to God. See p. 131.

Tertullian considers “ the monarchy of  
 “ God, as not infringed by being com-  
 “ mitted to the Son, especially as it is not  
 “ infringed by being committed to innu-  
 “ merable angels, who are said to be sub-  
 “ servient to the commands of God \*.”  
 “ How,” says he, “ do I destroy the mo-  
 “ narchy, who suppose the Son derived  
 “ from the substance of the Father, who  
 “ receives all power from the Father, and

τω οὐτι ἐστὶν ὁ θεός, ὃς ἀρχὴν τῶν ὁππῶντων ἐποίησεν, μνησθῶν τοῦ προ-  
 γογονῆν γινῶν. Strom. lib. 6. p. 614.

\* Atqui nullam dico dominationem ita unius sui esse, ita singularem, ita monarchiam, ut non etiam per alias proximas personas administraretur, quas ipsa prospexerit officiales sibi. Si vero et filius fuerit ei, cujus monarchia fit, non statim dividi eam, et monarchiam esse desinere, si particeps ejus adsumatur et filius: sed proinde illius esse principaliter a quo communicatur in filium; et dum illius est, proinde monarchiam esse, quæ a duobus tam unicis continetur. Igitur si et monarchia divina per tot legiones et exercitus angelorum administratur, sicut scriptum est, nilles millia adfistebant ei, et millics centena millia apparebant ei: nec ideo unius esse desit, ut desinat monarchia esse, quia per tanta millia virtutum procuratur. Ad Praxeam, sect. 3. p. 502.

“ does

“ does nothing without the Father’s will ;  
 “ he being a servant to his Father \*.” He  
 says that “ Paul is speaking of the Father  
 “ only, when he speaks of *him whom no*  
 “ *man has seen, or can see, and as the king*  
 “ *eternal, immortal, and invisible, the only*  
 “ *God†.*” “ According to the œconomy  
 “ of the gospel, the Father chose that the  
 “ Son should be on earth, and himself  
 “ in heaven ; wherefore the Son himself,  
 “ looking upwards, prayed to the Father,  
 “ and teaches us to pray, saying, *Our Fa-*  
 “ *ther, who art in heaven ‡.*”

\* Ceterum, qui filium non aliunde deduco, sed de substantia patris, nihil facientem sine patris voluntate, omnem a patre consecutum potestatem, quomodo possum de fide destruere monarchiam, quam a patre filio traditam in filio servo. Ad Praxeam, sect. 3. p. 502.

† De patre autem ad Timotheum, quem nemo vidit hominum, sed nec videre potest. Exaggerans amplius, qui solus habet immortalitatem ; et lucem habitat inaccessibilem. De quo et supra dixerat, regi autem seculorum, immortalis, invisibilis, soli Deo. Ad Praxeam, sect. 15. p. 509.

‡ Tamen in ipsa œconomia, pater voluit filium in terris haberi, se vero in cœlis ; quo et ipse filius suspiciens, et orabat et postulabat a patre, quo et nos erectos docebat orare : pater pater qui es in cœlis. Ibid. sect. 23. p.

Origen says that “ God is the *αρχη* (the “ origin) to Christ, as Christ is the *αρχη* to “ those things which were made in the “ image of God\*.” “ Both the Father “ and the Son,” he says, “ are fountains ; “ the Father of divinity, the Son of lo- “ gos†.” “ The Father only is the good, “ and the Saviour, as he is the image of “ the invifible God, fo he is the image “ of his goodnefs‡.” “ The *logos* did “ whatever the Father ordered §.” “ The “ Saviour, and the Holy Spirit,” he fays, “ are more excelled by the Father, than he “ and the Holy Spirit excel other things, “ &c. and he, though excelling fuch and “ fuch great things (viz. thrones, prin- “ cipalities, and powers) in effence and “ office, and power and godhead (for he is “ *λογος εμψυχος* and wifdom) is by no means

\* *Αρχη αυτε ο πατηρ εστιν • ομοιος δε και χριστος αρχη των κατα εικονα γενομενων θεσ.* Comment, vol. 2. p. 18.

† *Αμφοτερα γαρ πηγης εχει χωραν, ο μιν πατηρ, θεωτη- τει, ο δε υιος, λογος.* Ibid. p. 47.

‡ *Και ο σωτηρ δε, ως εστιν εικων τε θεσ τε αορατε, ως και της αγαθοτητος αυτε εικων.* Vol. 1. p. 377.

§ *Προσαχθεντα δε τον λογον πεποινηκεναι παντα οσα ο πατηρ αυτω ενετειλατο.* Ad Celsum, lib. 2. p. 63.

“to be compared with the Father\*.” Speaking of the difference between the propositions *δια* and *υπο*, the former denoting *instrumentality*, and the latter proper *causality*, he says, “If all things were made “ (*δια*) by the *logos* (i. e. as the instrument) they were not made by (*υπο*) the “ *logos* (i. e. as the cause) but by one “ who is better and greater than the *logos* ; “ and who can that be but the Father†?”

Alluding to the unitarians, with whom, it is plain, he wished to stand on good terms, he says, “We may by this means “ solve the doubts which terrify many men, “ who pretend to great piety, and who are “ afraid of making two gods, and through “ this fall into vain and impious opinions ;

\* Ου συγκρίσει, ἀλλ’ ὑπερβαλλῶσα ὑπεροχὴ φαίμεν τὸν σωτήρα, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὑπερεχόμενον τοσαύτων καὶ πλεον ἢ τὰ πάσης ὥστε ὑπερέχει αὐτὸς καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα τῶν λοιπῶν, καὶ τῶν τυχερίων. Ἀλλ’ ὁμοίως τῶν τοσαύτων καὶ τηλικούτων ὑπερέχων ἐστὶν, καὶ πρεσβεία, καὶ δυνάμει, καὶ θειότητι (ἐμφύχως γὰρ ἐστὶ λόγος) καὶ σοφία, καὶ συγκριεῖται κατ’ ἐξουσίαν τῷ πατρί. Comment. vol. 2. p. 218.

† Οὕτω τοίνυν καὶ ἐνθάδε εἰ πάντα *δια* τὸν λόγον ἐγένετο, ἔχον *υπο* τὸν λόγον ἐγένετο, ἀλλ’ ὑπο κριτήριος καὶ μείζων τοῦ πατρὸς τὸν λόγον. τίς δ’ ἂν ἀλλ’ ἐλ’ τυγχάνῃ ἢ ὁ πατήρ. In Johan. Comment. vol. 2. p. 56.

“ denying

“ denying that the nature of the Son is dif-  
 “ ferent from that of the Father, and who  
 “ acknowledge that he is God in name  
 “ only ; or denying the divinity of the  
 “ Son, and then maintaining that his na-  
 “ ture and essence is different from that of  
 “ the Father. For we must tell them, that  
 “ he who is *God of himself*, is God with  
 “ the article ; but that all who are not God  
 “ of themselves, who are divine by becom-  
 “ ing partakers of his divinity, are God  
 “ without the article, and severally, among  
 “ whom especially is the first-born of all  
 “ the creatures\*.”

\* Και το πολλὰς φιλοθεῶς εἶναι εὐχομένους ταρασσόν, εὐλο-  
 γούμενους δύο ἀναγορεύσαι θεοὺς, καὶ παρὰ τὸ πλεονέκτημα  
 ψευδέσι καὶ ἀσεβέσι δόγμασιν, ἢ ἢ ἀρνεμένους ἰδιοῦντα υἱὸς  
 εἶναι παρὰ τὴν τὴν πατρὸς, ὁμολογούντας θεὸν εἶναι τὸν μετὰ  
 ὀνομασθῆναι παρὰ αὐτοῖς υἱὸν προσαγορευόμενον· ἢ ἀρνεμένους τὴν  
 θεοῦντα τὴν υἱὸς τιθεῖντα δὲ αὐτὴν τὴν ἰδιοῦντα, καὶ τὴν ἑσῖαν  
 κατὰ περιγραφὴν τυγχάνουσιν εἶναι τὴν πατρὸς, ἐντεθεν λυε-  
 θῆναι δύναται· λεκτέον γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὅτι τότε μὲν αὐτοθεὸς ὁ  
 θεὸς ἐστὶ, διότι καὶ ὁ σωτὴρ φησὶν ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα  
 εὐχῇ· ἵνα γινώσκωσιν σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν· πάντες δὲ το  
 παρὰ τὸ αὐτὸ θεὸς μετοχὴ τῆς ἐκείνου θεότητος θεοποιούμενον,  
 καὶ ὁ θεός, ἀλλὰ θεὸς κυριώτερον ἀνὴρ λεγοίτο ὡς πάντως ὁ πρωτο-  
 γέννητος πάσης κτίσεως, ἀπὸ πρῶτος τῷ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εἶναι.

Comment. vol. 2. p. 47.

The article, he says, is added when the word God signifies the unbegotten cause of all things \*. This observation of Origen will be seen to have been borrowed from Philo, and it is void of all foundation.

The writer of a book ascribed to Origen, expresses his opinion of the inferiority of the Son to the Father in a peculiarly strong manner, when he speaks of the propriety of praying to the Father only. For he represents it as the custom of christians not to pray to any other than “ the principal “ god, not to his servants the prophets, or “ to Christ, or to the apostles †.

Origen speaks of “ no christian praying “ to any other than the God who is over

It is evident from this passage that the ancient unitarians would say, that if Christ be God, it is only in name, and that his divinity is the same with that of the Father; or else that he has no divinity at all, and is of a nature entirely different from the Father.

\* Τιθησι μὲν γὰρ τὸ ἀρθρον, ὅτε ἡ θεὸς ὀνομασία ἐπὶ τῷ ἀγεννητῷ τασσεται τῶν ὅλων αἰτιῶ. Orig. in Joh. vol. 2. p. 46.

† Ἰν ὡς πρῶτον προσκυνῆθῃ θεός· ὁ παρ τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς θεῷ παρόντι καὶ ταῖς προφήταις· καὶ τῷ πληρωματι νομῶ χρεῖσθαι· καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐς τὸ πατέρα. *Contra Marcionitas*, p. 212.

“ all,



“all, by our Saviour, the Son of God  
 “who is the logos, the wisdom, and the  
 “truth\*.” “If we know,” says he, “what  
 “prayer is, we must not pray to any created  
 “being, not to Christ himself, but only  
 “to God the Father of all, to whom our  
 “Saviour himself prayed†.” “We are  
 “not to pray to a brother, who has the  
 “same common father with ourselves;  
 “Jesus himself saying, that we must pray  
 “to the Father through him.—In this we  
 “are all agreed, and are not divided about  
 “the method of prayer; but should we not  
 “be divided, if some prayed to the Father,  
 “and some to the Son. Common peo-  
 “ple,” he says “through a great mistake,  
 “and want of distinguishing, prayed to

\* Οὐκ εἰσὶν ἄλλω θάρρειν εὐχεσθαι, ἢ τῷ πρὸς πάντα διαρκεῖ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ, διὰ τὴν σωτηρίαν ἡμῶν οὐκ διὰ τὴν θεοῦ· ὅς ἐστιν λόγος, καὶ σοφία, καὶ ἀληθεία, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα λεγούσι περὶ αὐτοῦ αἱ τῶν πρῶτων τῶν θεῶν καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων τῶν Ἰησοῦ γραφαί. *Ad Celsum*, lib. 5. p. 233.

† Ἐὰν δὲ ἀκωῶμεν ὅτι ποτὲ ἐστὶ προσευχή, μὴ ποτέ ἐξ ἐνὶ τῶν γεννητῶν προσευκτεῶν ἐστὶ, ἐδὲ αὐτῷ τῷ χριστῷ· ἀλλὰ μόνῳ τῷ θεῷ τῶν ὅλων καὶ πατρὶ, ὃ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν προσνυχετο ὡς προπαρεδέμεθα. *De Oratione*, p. 48.

“ the Son either with the Father, or without the Father †.”

Here I cannot help repeating what I observed before, that, if Christ had been what Origen, among others, supposed him to have been, viz. *the operative faculties of the Father*, and the very being who made the world, and who governed it, he could not but have been considered as the proper object of prayer, even in preference to the Father himself; because, on that principle, we should have had more to do with the Son than with the Father, being more immediately dependent upon him; so that it could not have given any umbrage to the Father, if all our addresses had been made to the Son. The same reason, whatever

\* Ἀδελφῶ δε προσευχεσθαι τας κατήξιωμενες εως αὐτῆ πατρὸς ἐκ  
εἶναι εὐλογον· μόνῳ γὰρ τῷ πατρὶ μὲν ἐμὲ καὶ δι' ἐμὲ ἀναπεμπτεον εἶναι  
ὑμῖν προσευχὴν. ταυτὶ ἐν λεγούσῃ ἀκούεις Ἰησοῦ, τῷ θεῷ δι' αὐτῆς ευ-  
χωμεδα, τὸ αὐτὸ λεγούεις πάντες, μηδὲ περὶ τῆς τροπῆς τῆς εὐχῆς σχι-  
ζομενοι· ἢ ἐχι σχιζομεδα, εἰαν οἱ μὲν τῷ πατρὶ, οἱ δὲ τῷ υἱῷ ευχωμεδα;  
ιδιωτῶν ἀμαρτίαν κατὰ πολλὴν ἀκραιολογία διὰ τὸ ἀβασανισον καὶ ἀνεξέλα-  
σον ἀμαρτανότων των προσευχομενων τῷ υἱῷ, εἴτε μέγα τῷ πατρὶ, εἴτε  
χωρὶς τῷ πατρὶ. De Oratione, p. 51.

it was, that made it proper for Christ to make and govern the world, in preference to the Father, would make it equally proper that he should be the object of prayer in preference to the Father. Since, therefore, it is acknowledged that, in early times, Christ was not the object of prayer, even to those who believed him to be their creator and governor, we may be assured that he was not generally considered in that light; and especially that he had not been so considered from the beginning; for then a different practice would necessarily have been established.

In the next place, I shall produce some passages from Novatian, whose orthodoxy, with respect to the doctrine of the trinity, was never questioned. He says, “the  
“ Father only is the only good God\*.”  
“ The rule of truth teaches us to believe,  
“ after the Father, in the Son of God,  
“ Christ Jesus, our Lord God, but the  
“ Son of God, of that God who is one,

\* Quem solum merito bonum pronunciat dominus.  
Cap. 4. p. 11.

“ and alone, the maker of all things\*.”  
 “ Though he was in the form of God, he  
 “ did not attempt the robbery of being equal  
 “ with God. For though he knew that he  
 “ was God of God the Father, he never  
 “ compared himself with God the Father;  
 “ remembering that he was of the Fa-  
 “ ther, and that he had what the Fa-  
 “ ther gave him†.” “ The Son is less  
 “ than the Father, because he is sanctified  
 “ by him‡.” “ God the Father is the  
 “ maker and creator of all, who alone has  
 “ no origin, invifible, immense, immortal,  
 “ eternal, the one God, to whose greatness,

\* Eadem regula veritatis docet nos credere post patrem etiam in filium Dei Christum Jesum dominum Deum nostrum, sed Dei filium, hujus Dei qui et unus et solus est, conditor scilicet rerum omnium. Cap. 9. p. 26.

† Hic ergo quamvis esset in forma Dei, non est rapinam arbitratus æqualem se Deo esse. Quamvis enim se ex Deo patre Deum esse meminisset; nunquam se Deo patri aut comparavit aut contulit, memor se esse ex suo patre, et hoc ipsum quod est habere se, quia pater dedisset. Cap. 22. p. 84.

‡ Dum ergo accipit sanctificationem a patre, minor patre est. Cap. 27. p. 102.

“ majesty,

“ majesty, and power, nothing can be pre-  
 “ ferred or compared \*.” “ If Christ had  
 “ been uncreated, and likewise unbegotten,  
 “ there would have been two unbegotten,  
 “ and therefore two gods †.” “ The Son  
 “ does nothing of his own pleasure, nor does  
 “ he come of himself ; but in all things  
 “ obeys his Father’s commands ‡.” Al-  
 luding to the Sabellians, he says, that “ very  
 “ many of the heretics, being moved with  
 “ the greatness and truth of his divinity,  
 “ extending his honours too far, have dared  
 “ to advance that he is not the Son, but

\* Est ergo Deus pater omnium institutor et creator, solus originem nesciens, invisibilis, immensus, immortalis, æternus, unus Deus, cujus neque magnitudini neque majestati neque virtuti quicquam non dixerim præferri, sed nec comparari potest. Cap. 31. p. 119.

† Si enim natus non fuisset ; innatus comparatus cum eo qui esset innatus, æquatione in utroque ostensa duos faceret innatos, et ideo duos faceret deos : si non genitus esset ; collatus cum eo qui genitus non esset, et æquales inventi, duos deos merito reddidissent non geniti : atque ideo duos Christus reddidisset deos. Cap. 31. p. 122.

‡ Filius autem nihil ex arbitrio suo gerit, nec ex consilio suo facit, nec a se venit, sed imperiis paternis omnibus et præceptis obedit. Cap. 31. p. 123.

“ God the Father himself \*.” This, he says, afterwards is to acknowledge the divinity of Christ in too boundless and unrestrained a manner †.

Arnobius says, that “ the omnipotent, and “ only God, sent Christ ‡.” And again, “ Christ, a God, spake by the order of “ the principal God §.”

“ The Son,” says Lactantius, “ patiently “ obeys the will of the Father, and does “ nothing but what the Father wills or orders ||.” “ He approved his fidelity to

\* Usque adeo hunc manifestum est in scripturis esse Deum tradi, ut plerique hæreticorum, divinitatis ipsius magnitudine et veritate commoti, ultra modum extendentes honores ejus, auferrent non filium, sed ipsum Deum patrem promovere vel putare. Cap. 23. p. 87.

† Effrenatius et effusius in Christo divinitatem confiteri. Ibid.

‡ Tum demum emisit Christum, Deus omnipotens, Deus solus. Lib. 2. p. 57.

§ Deus inquam Christus (hoc enim sæpe dicendum est ut infidelium diffiliat et dirumpatur auditus) Dei principis jussione loquens. Ibid. p. 50.

|| Quia voluntati patris fideliter paret, nec unquam faciat aut fecerit, nisi quod pater aut voluit, aut jussit. Lib. 4. sect. 29. p. 447.

“ God ;

“ God; for he taught that there is one  
“ God, and that he only ought to be wor-  
“ shipped; nor did he ever say that he was  
“ God. For he would not have preserved  
“ his allegiance, if, being sent to take away  
“ a multiplicity of Gods, and to preach *one*  
“ *God*, he had brought in another, besides  
“ that one. This would not have been to  
“ be the herald of one God, or him who  
“ sent him, but have been doing his own  
“ business, and separating himself from him  
“ whom he came to honour. Wherefore,  
“ because he was so faithful, because he as-  
“ sumed nothing to himself, that he might  
“ fulfil the commands of him who sent  
“ him, he received the dignity of perpe-  
“ tual priest, the honour of supreme king,  
“ the power of a judge, and the title of  
“ God\*.”

\* Ille vero exhibuit Deo fidem. Docuit enim quod unus Deus sit, eumque solum coli oportere: nec unquam se ipse Deum dixit: quia non servasset fidem; si missus, ut deos tolleret, et unum affereret; induceret alium, præter unum. Hoc erat, non de uno Deo facere præconium; nec ejus, qui miserat, sed suum proprium negotium gerere; ac se ab eo, quem illustratum venerat, separare. Propterea quia tam fidelis extitit, quia sibi nihil prorsus assumpsit, ut

The same language was held by Eusebius, who wrote about the time of the council of Nice. “Christ,” he says, “the  
 “only begotten Son of God, and the first-  
 “born of every creature, teaches us to  
 “call his Father the only true God, and  
 “commands us to worship him only\*.”  
 “There is one God, and the only begot-  
 “ten comes out of him†.” “Christ being  
 “neither the supreme God, nor an angel,  
 “is of a middle nature between them;  
 “and being neither the supreme God, nor  
 “a man, but the mediator, is in the middle  
 “between them, the only begotten Son of  
 “God ‡.” He has the same sentiment in

mandata mittentis impleret: et sacerdotis perpetui dignitatum, et regis summi honorem, et judicis potestatem, et Dei nomen accepit. Lib. 4. sect. 14. p. 395.

\* Οτι ὁ αὐλὸς ὁ μονογενὴς τὸ θεὸν καὶ πατριότοκος τῶν ὁλῶν ἡ παλίων ἀρχὴ, τὸν αὐτὸν πατέρα μόνον ἡγεῖσθαι θεὸν ἀληθινόν. καὶ μόνον σεβῆναι ἡμῶν παρακελευέσθαι. Præparatio, lib. 7. cap. 15. p. 327.

† Διὸ δὴ καὶ μόνος θεὸς αὐλὸς ὁ μονογενὴς δ’ ἐξ αὐτοῦ προεῖσιν. De Laudibus Const. p. 752.

‡ Ωστε, μήτε αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν ἐπὶ παλίων θεὸν ἡγεῖσθαι. μήτε τῶν ἀγγέλων ἓνα· τῶν δὲ μέσων καὶ μεσσιτῶν. οἳ τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ἀγγέλοις μεσιτεύει, ὡς ἀν παλιν, οἷε μεσίτης γινέσθαι θεὸς καὶ ἀνθρώπων, μέσος ὧν ἐκάλειεται γαμῶτος εὐθέριος· ἐστίν. μεσίτης ὑπαρχῶν. εἰ αὐλὸς ὧν, ὁ εἰς καὶ μόνος θεός· ἢ ὁμοίως τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἀνθρώπος· τί δὲ, εἰ μὴδὲν τῶν· ἡ

θεὸς



his books on the praises of Constantine.  
 “ Christ was of a middle nature between  
 “ things created, and him that had no ori-  
 “ gin \*.”

We are now approaching to the time when we shall hear no more of this language from those who were reputed *orthodox*. We do, however, hear the same sentiment occasionally, when the writers were off their guard, and expressed themselves according to the ideas of their predecessors, especially writers near to those times. Thus, Athanasius says, that “ Christ does every thing  
 “ according to the will and knowledge of  
 “ the Father †.”

Theodoret, having mentioned the great distance between the unbegotten Father and rational and irrational beings, who were by him (ὕπ' αὐτοῦ) produced out of nothing, says, that “ his only begotten Son, by whom

ὁὐκ μονογενὴς υἱός, νυν μὲν ἀνθρώπων καὶ θεὸς μεσότης γεγονώς. *Contra Marcellum*, lib. 1. p. 8.

\* Μεσίτευον τε καὶ διεργον τῆς τῶν γεννητῶν ἔσσης, τὴν ἀναρχὸν καὶ ἀγενήτων ἰδεάν. P. 719. 757.

† Τα πάντα πρὸς θεῶν καὶ γνωστὴν τε εαυτῷ πατρός ἐργάζεσθαι. *Contra Gentes*, Opera, vol. 1. p. 48.

“ (δι ης)

“ (δὲ) all things were made out of nothing,  
 “ is of a middle nature between them \*.”

At the close of this section I shall observe, in general, that whenever the Antenicene Fathers used the term *God* absolutely, they always meant the Father only. But if, in their idea, the Father had been no more entitled to the appellation of *God* than the Son or the Spirit, they would certainly have confined the use of the word *God* to express *divinity in general*, and have used the word *Father*, and not *God*, when they really meant the Father only, exclusively of the two other persons. Had there been no proper correlative to the word *Son*, as a person, nothing could have been inferred from this; but since the term *Father* is perfectly correlative to the term *Son*, and as familiar, it would certainly have been used by them to denote the Father, as well as the term *Son* to denote the Son. It is natural, therefore, to conclude, that their

\* Ἀγνοοῦντες οἱ ἀνασκητικοί, ὡς μᾶλλον ἀν εἴη μετὰ ξυ πατρός ἀγεννητός, καὶ τῶν κτισθέντων ὑπ αὐτοῦ ἐξ ἑκ οὐτῶν, λογικῶν τε καὶ ἀλογῶν. ὡν μεσιτεύουσα φύσις μονογενής, δι ἧς τὰ ὅλα ἐξ ἑκ οὐτῶν ἐποίησεν ὁ πατήρ τε θεὸς λόγος. Opera, vol. 3. p. 18.

custom of using the term *God* to denote the Father only was derived to them from earlier times, in which no other than the Father was deemed to be God, in any proper sense of the word. This language was continued long after, from a change of ideas, it ceased to be proper.

Very happily, the word *God* is still, in common use, appropriated to the Father, so that none but professed theologians are habitual trinitarians, and probably not even these at all times ; and while the scriptures are read without the comments of men, the Father alone will be considered as God, and the sole object of worship, exclusively of the Son, or the Spirit.

## C H A P T E R V.

*Of the Power and Dignity of Christ as the pre-existing Logos of the Father.*

THE great obstacle to the reception of christianity, especially with persons distinguished for their learning, or their rank in life, was the meanness of the person, and condition of Christ; and especially the circumstance of his having been crucified as a common malefactor. Those who had disciples, called by their names, in Greece, if they had not been distinguished for their wealth and rank in life, which was the case with some of them, had, at least, been men whose time had, in a great measure, been devoted to study, and none of them had been reckoned *infamous*. The death of Socrates bore some resemblance to that of Christ, but besides that the circumstances of the deaths themselves were considerably different, he had lived in intimacy with the first men of the state, and though not rich himself, had always been respected

respected by the rich; and his life had been devoted to speculation and instruction. Whereas Christ had had no advantage of liberal education, or leisure for study and speculation. He was born of obscure parents, and had lived in a very obscure town of the most despised part of his country; and till he was thirty years of age, when he commenced public teacher, had been nothing more than a common carpenter.

These circumstances might not have been much attended to beyond the limits of his own country. But his public execution as a common malefactor, was known wherever the name and religion of Jesus was heard of; and though he might not be thought guilty of any crime (as it was no uncommon thing in any country for persons to be condemned, and suffer unjustly) yet the manner of his death sufficiently shewed the low estimation in which he had been held in his life, and marked him for one of the meanest of mankind. To be hanged at Tyburn in this country, or to be broke upon the wheel in France, gives us

I

but

but a faint idea of the ignominy of *crucifixion* in the Roman empire.

This was one of the greatest difficulties that the first preachers of christianity had to struggle with, in their attempts to propagate christianity; and the weight of it was much greater than we, who are brought up with a high idea of the great personal dignity of Christ, notwithstanding the mean circumstances of his life, can be duly sensible of, or make sufficient allowance for. The apostles, and first preachers of christianity in general, being themselves illiterate men, had no means of removing this great obstacle, but by their accounts of the miracles wrought by Jesus Christ, and his resurrection from the dead; which were sufficient proofs of his divine mission. Also the miracles which the apostles themselves wrought, and the gifts of the Holy Spirit, communicated to all the early converts, were standing proofs, during the age of the apostles, of the power of God accompanying their preaching. These plain arguments were all that the apostles, as we may see by their writings, ever opposed to the pride of  
the

the Jews, or the cavils and contempt of the Greeks. For a long time, christianity seems to have spread chiefly among the illiterate, though it was by no means confined to persons of low circumstances, especially out of Judea ; and though we may easily perceive that, to use the apostles language, *not many rich men were called*, yet there were more of the rich than of the wise.

At length, however, some of the Greek philosophers embraced christianity ; and, as was natural, they were desirous of making converts of others ; and therefore would wish to recommend it to them, by exhibiting it in such a light as they imagined would make it appear to the most advantage ; and in order to this they would endeavour to make it seem to be as little different from the philosophy to which they had been addicted as possible. Besides, all men are willing to combine into one system all the doctrines which they espouse ; and they never reject any thing that they have been long attached to, without an evident necessity. These philosophers, therefore, even without any view to making converts, would not abandon

don their former tenets, unless they perceived that it was absolutely impossible to retain them, and their profession of christianity together; and certainly they would not themselves be so ready to see the inconsistency there might be between them as other persons less interested might have been. As to those plain men from whom these philosophers had first heard the christian doctrines, they might admit their historical evidence to matters of fact, and thus be convinced of the truth of christianity; but, considering them as ignorant and unlearned persons, might not chuse to be dictated to by them in matters of *deep speculation*; and, wretched as the state of science was in those ages, the *pride of philosophy*, and the *contempt of the vulgar*, were much greater than they are now.

It happened that the philosophy which was most in vogue in that age was *Platonism*, the principles of which have been seen to be more conformable to those of revealed religion in general, than those of any other system that was taught in the Grecian schools; as it contained the doc-  
trines



trines of the unity of God, the reality of a providence, and the immortality of the soul. But, unhappily, making a difference between the Supreme Being himself, and his *mind*, or *ideas*; and giving an obscure notion of its being by means of a *divine efflux*, that all truth is perceived by the mind, as common objects are seen by the beams of the sun; they imagined that a ray of this wisdom, or the great *second divine principle* in their system, might illuminate Jesus Christ, and even have permanently attached itself to him. And with respect to this divine principle, which qualified him to be a public teacher, they might easily imagine that he had had an existence from the time that any divine operation took place; so that they no longer looked upon themselves as the disciples of an obscure person, who had lately started up, and made himself conspicuous by new doctrines, but of that great being who was instrumental in making the world, and who was the source of all truth.

This idea was highly flattering, and the philosophers lately become christians, see-

ing that Philo had availed himself of the same platonic notions, to explain the history of the divine dispensations in the Old Testament, followed him in this progress, and extended the same to the New; supposing that the same divine logos, which Philo had represented as the medium of all the visible appearances of God to the patriarchs, was the same that was manifested in Jesus Christ.

This system gave a dignity to the person and character of Christ, which effectually covered *the offence of the cross*. It made the profession of christianity fit much easier upon the minds of these philosophers themselves, and furnished them with arguments by which to recommend it to others, who entertained the same philosophical principles. In this specious manner were the doctrines of the *pre-existence* and *divinity of Christ*, introduced into the christian system.

That it was the meanness of Christ's person, and the circumstances of his death, at which the heathen philosophers revolted, we have abundant evidence. "The  
"heathens," says Arnobius "reproach  
"christians

“ christians with worshipping a man\*.”  
 “ The Gods are offended at you,” say they,  
 “ not because you worship the God that is  
 “ omnipotent, but because you daily pray  
 “ to a man who was born, and (which is in-  
 “ famous even to the vilest person) put to  
 “ death by crucifixion, and because you  
 “ maintain that he is a God, and is now  
 “ alive †.” “ What is the reason,” says  
 Austin, “ that you will not be christians, but  
 “ because Christ came in humility, and  
 “ you are proud ‡.”

But when christians had found *two na-  
 tures* in Christ, a *divine* as well as a *human*  
 nature, they could easily answer this re-  
 proach of the heathens. “ Who was it,”

\* Natum hominem colimus. Lib. I. p. 12.

† Sed non (inquit) idcirco dii vobis infesti sunt, quod omnipotentem colatis Deum : sed quod hominem natum, et (quod personis infame est vilibus) crucis supplicio interemptum, et Deum fuisse contenditis, et superesse adhuc creditus, et quotidianis supplicationibus adoratis. Ibid. Supra.

‡ Quid causæ est cur propter opiniones vestras, quas vos ipsi oppugnatis christiani esse nolitis, nisi quia Christus humiliter venit, et vos superbi estis. De Civitate Dei, lib. 10. cap. 29. Opera, vol. 5. p. 591.

says Arnobius, “ that was seen hanging on  
 “ the cross? The man whom he put on,  
 “ and whom he carried with him. The  
 “ death you speak of was that of the man  
 “ he had assumed, that of the burthen, not  
 “ of the bearer\*.” This was an answer  
 that we do not find to have occurred to the  
 apostles. “ Cavilling at the cross,” Atha-  
 nasius says, “ they do not see that his  
 “ power fills the whole world, and that ac-  
 “ tions shewing him to be God are per-  
 “ formed by him†.”

It was also a great objection to chris-  
 tianity that the system was *new*, and the  
 author of it a person of yesterday. But this  
 sublime doctrine, of Christ being the *divine*  
*logos*, and the medium of all the divine  
 communications of God to mankind, en-  
 abled them to repel this accusation with

\* Quis est ergo visus in patibulo pendere, quis mortuus  
 est? homo, quem induerat, et secum ipse portabat. Mors  
 illa, quam dicitis, assumpti hominis fuit, non ipsius: ges-  
 taminis, non gestantis. Lib. I. p. 22.

† Οι τον ταιρον διαβαλλοντες, εχωσιν την τειε δυναμιν πασαν την  
 οικουμένης πεπληρωκυαν • η̃ οι δι αυτε τα της θεογνωσιας εργα  
 ποιαι πεφανερωται. Contra Gentes, Opera, vol. I. p. 2.

great advantage. Eusebius gives an account of the appearances of Christ under the Old Testament ; “ lest any person,” as he says, “ should object to him as a new “ person.\*” In this view, he says, “ the “ patriarchs may, in one sense be called “ christians†.” Cassian says, that “ Mary “ produced one who was older than herself, “ even her own maker, so that she was the “ parent of her parent ‡.”

Christians were even ready to go farther than this in order to recommend their religion to heathens. They did not even scruple to point out some resemblances between it and the grossest polytheism. Justin

\* Ταύτα μὲν ἐν ἀναγκαιῶς πρὸς τῆς ἱστορίας ἐκλαυθὰ μοι κεῖσθαι, ὥς ἂν μὴ νεώτερον τις εἶναι νομίσειε τὸν σῶτῆρα καὶ κυρίον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν τὸν χριστόν, διὰ τὰς τῆς ἐνσαρκῆς πολυθείας αὐτοῦ χρόνας. Hist. lib. I. cap. 4. p. 14.

† Πάντας δ' ἐκεῖνες δικαιοσύνη μεμαρτυρημένους, ἐξ αὐτοῦ τε Ἀβραάμ ἐπὶ τὸν πρῶτον ἀνέστην ἀνθρώπον, ἐργῶ χριστιανούς, εἰ καὶ μὴ ὀνομαζή προσειπῶν τις, ἔκ ἂν εὖλος βαλοῖ τῆς ἀληθείας. Ibid. p. 15.

‡ Vides ergo quod non solum inquam antiquiorem se Maria peperit: non solum inquam antiquiorem se, sed autorem sui, et procreans procreatorem suum, facta est parentis parens. De incarnatione Domini, lib. 4. p. 1001.

Martyr, speaking of Jesus, as styled the *Son of God*, says, “ If, in the usual style, and as  
 “ a man only, he be worthy to be called  
 “ the Son of God, on account of his wis-  
 “ dom, all writers call Jupiter the father  
 “ of gods and men. But if in a peculiar  
 “ manner, out of the way of common ge-  
 “ neration, we say that Christ is the *logos*  
 “ of God; this agrees with those who  
 “ hold Mercury to be the wisdom of God,  
 “ which explains his will. If we say that  
 “ he was born of a virgin, this is only what  
 “ is said of Perseus\*.”

With the same view (not so much to be condemned if we consider its circumstances, and the mere morality of the thing) Justin Martyr, as far as appears, invented the doctrine of Christ being the *logos* of God; but it was only the same that Philo had before represented as the medium of all

\* Υἱὸς καὶ θεὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λεγόμενος, εἰ καὶ κοινῶς μόνον ἀνθρώπος, δια σοφίαν ἀξιῖται υἱὸς θεοῦ λεγέσθαι, πάντερά γὰρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε πάντες συγγραφεῖς τὸν θεὸν καλεσθιν. εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδίως παρὰ τὴν κοινὴν γένεσιν γεγενῆσθαι αὐτὸν ἐκ θεοῦ λεγόμενον λόγον θεοῦ, ὡς προεφημὴν, κοινῶν τέλει ἐστὶν ὑμῖν τοῖς τοῦ Ἑβραίου λόγον τὸν παρὰ θεοῦ, ἀγγελλόμενον λεγέσθαι. Εἰ δὲ δια πάσης γεγενῆσθαι φερόμεν, κοινὸν καὶ τέλος πρὸς τὸν Περσεὺς ἐστὶν ὑμῖν. Apol. I. p. 33, 34.

the

the communications of God to the patriarchs. He also extended this principle as a compliment to the philosophy of the Greeks; supposing this also to have been inspired by the same logos; and in this he was followed by several others, though in a later period christians were ashamed of having conceded to the heathens, so far as to suppose that the Grecian philosophy had the same divine origin with christianity. “All that the philosophers and “legislators said and taught,” says Justin Martyr, “was effected and discovered “according to a portion of the logos; but “because they did not discover every thing “of the logos, they often differed among “themselves.—Christ was in part known “to Socrates, for the logos was in him, “and in every person, by the prophets “foretelling things to come, and concern- “ing himself being made like us, and “teaching us these things\*.”

\* Όσα γὰρ καλῶς αἰεὶ ἐφθελγῶντο καὶ εὗρον οἱ φιλοσοφῆσαντες ἡ νομοθεῖσσαντες, καὶ αὐτὰ λόγῳ μερῶν εὗρεσθαι καὶ θεωρεῖν ἐστὶ πρὸν ἡμετέροις. ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ πάντα τὰ τῶν λόγων ἐγνωρίσαν, οὗ ἐστι χεῖρος, καὶ ἐναντία ἐαυτοῖς πολλοὶς εἶπον. Χρῆστον δὲ, τῷ καὶ ὑπὸ Σωκράτους αὐτοῦ μερῶν

Clemens Alexandrinus followed Justin Martyr in this doctrine ; supposing the logos that was united to Christ to have been the same principle which the Divine Being had in all ages made use of, as an instrument to instruct mankind, whether by means of the Greek philosophy, or any other system. He calls the logos “ the instrument of God, by which he made man,” giving him the title of (σοφία υπέρκοσμι) *supra mundane wisdom*\*,” He says, that “ our Saviour is called the logos on account of his inventing rational methods for the instruction of men†.” “ Let us,” says he, “ glorify the blessed œconomy, by which man is instructed and sanctified, as a child of God.”——“ The logos both makes all things, and teaches all things. As the horse is led by the bridle, and the bull

γνωσθέντι (λογος γὰρ ἦν καὶ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐν παντί ων, καὶ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν προεῖπὼν τὰ μέλλοντα γινέσθαι, καὶ δι’ ἐαυτοῦ ὁμοιοπαθεῖς γενομένους καὶ διδάξαντι ταῦτα). Apol. 2. p. 124, 125.

\* Ad Gentes. p. 4.

† Ταῦτη ἐν καὶ σωτῆρι ὁ λόγος περικείμενος, ὁ τὰ λογικὰ ταῦτα ἐξευρῶν ἀνθρώποις εἰς ευαίσθησιαν καὶ σωτηρίαν φάρμακον. Pæd. lib. 1. cap.

12. p. 134.

“ by



“ by the yoke, so man by the logos\*.”  
 “ God, as the author of all good, was the  
 “ author of the Greek philosophy; and  
 “ this was the schoolmaster to the Greeks,  
 “ as the law was to the Jews, preparing  
 “ the way for christianity †.” He else-  
 where says, “ God gave the Greek phi-  
 “ losophy by the inferior angels ‡.” So  
 that he seems to have adopted the doctrine  
 of Philo, in making angels not to be per-  
 manent beings, but only temporary appear-  
 ances of the logos.

\* Την μακαριαν δοξαζωμεν οικονομιαν δι ην παιδαγωγείται μεν ο ανθρωπος, αγιαζεται δε ως δεσ παιδιον. η πολιτευεται μεν εν υρανις απο γης παιδαγωγουμενος. πατερα δε εκει λαμβανει, ον επι γης μω-  
 θανει. παντα ο λογος η ποιει, η διδασκει, η παιδαγωγει. ιππος, αγειν χαλινω· η ταυρος αγειν ζυγω· θηριον βροχω αλισιεται· ο δε ανθρωπος, μεταπλασσειν λογω. *Pæd. lib. 1. cap. 12. p. 265.*

† Παντων μεν γαρ αιτιος των καλων ο θεος. αλλα των μεν καλα προ-  
 ηγμενον, ως της τε διαιτηκης της παλαιας η της νεας. των δε, καί  
 επακολουθημα, ως της φιλοσοφιας. ταχα δε η προηγμενος τοις  
 ελλησιν εδοθη τοις, ωρη η τον κυριον καλεσαι η της ελληνας. επαιδα-  
 γωγει γαρ η αυτη το ελλητικον, ως ο νομος της εθραιας, εις χριστον.  
 προπαραιοσκευαζει τοινον η φιλοσοφια, προσδοποιουσα τον υπο χριστη  
 τελειωμενον.—Καταφαινεται τοινον προπαιδεια η ελληνικη, συν η αυτη  
 φιλοσοφια θεοθεν ηκειν εις ανθρωπους. *Strom. lib. 1. p. 282. 287.*  
 See also *Strom. lib. 6. p. 636. 648.*

‡ Ουλος εστιν ο διδως και τοις ελλησι την φιλοσοφιαν δια των υποδε-  
 στερων αγγελων. *Ibid. lib. 7. p. 703.*

This

This idea of the source of the Greek philosophy was exactly that of Justin Martyr, who says, “ the doctrine of Plato is  
 “ not foreign from that of Christ, though  
 “ not in all respects like it ; as neither is  
 “ that of the stoicks, the poets, and histo-  
 “ rians. For each of them, from a por-  
 “ tion of the divine logos implanted in  
 “ them, perceiving something similar,” viz.  
 to the christian doctrine, “ very justly de-  
 “ livered it \*.”

On this principle, these writers could talk very magnificently concerning the dignity of Christ, but in a manner which would have been very little understood, or relished, by the apostles. Clemens Alex-  
 “ andrinus gives the following sublime de-  
 scription of Christ as the logos of God, representing him as “ most holy and per-  
 “ fect in his nature, supreme in autho-  
 “ rity and beneficence, nearest to the only  
 “ omnipotent nature, which disposes of all

\* Ουχ ολι αλλοτρια εσι τα Πλατων<sup>Θ</sup> διδασκαλ<sup>αι</sup> τε χρ<sup>ι</sup>στ<sup>ε</sup>, αλλ' ολι  
 α<sup>ν</sup> εσι παν<sup>η</sup> ομο<sup>ι</sup>αι, ωσπε<sup>ρ</sup> εδε τα των αλλων, Στωικον τε, κ<sup>η</sup> ποιη<sup>τ</sup>ων,  
 κ<sup>η</sup> συγγραφεων. εκασ<sup>Θ</sup> γαρ τις απο με<sup>ρ</sup>ους τε σπε<sup>ρ</sup>ματικ<sup>η</sup>ς δε<sup>ι</sup>ς λογε<sup>ι</sup>  
 το συγγεν<sup>ε</sup>ς ο<sup>ν</sup>των, καλω<sup>ς</sup> εφ<sup>η</sup>δεγχα<sup>ν</sup>το. Apol. 2. p. 132.

“ things

“ things according to the will of the Fa-  
 “ ther—not separated, or divided, or re-  
 “ moving from place to place, not circum-  
 “ scribed; all mind, all paternal light, all  
 “ eye, seeing every thing, hearing every thing,  
 “ knowing every thing; by his power  
 “ searching all power. To him the whole  
 “ host of heaven and of gods is subject\*.”  
 Who could be ashamed of such a master  
 as this? But this was not the crucified  
 Jesus.

That it was Christ who taught the Greeks  
 their philosophy, was a doctrine afterwards  
 abandoned by the christians; but that he  
 was the medium of divine communication to  
 the patriarchs, was firmly retained, though

\* Τελειωτική δὴ καὶ ἀγιωτική, καὶ κυριωτική καὶ ηγεμονικωτική, καὶ βασιλικωτική, καὶ ευεργετικωτική ἡ υἱὸς φύσις, ἡ τῷ μόνῳ παντοκράτορι προσχευατική, αὕτη ἡ μεγίστη ὑπεροχὴ, ἡ τὰ πάντα διαλασσέσθαι καὶ τὸ θεῶν τε παῖς, καὶ τὸ πάντων ἀριστὸς οἰκίζει, ἀκαμάτω, καὶ ἀβύλω δυνάμει πάντα ἐργαζομένη, δι' ὧν ἐνεργεῖται ἀποκροφὲς ἐννοίας ἐπιβλεπέσθαι. ἔστι γὰρ ἐξισταίη πόλις τῆς αὐτῆς περὶ τῆς οὐκ υἱὸς τε θεῶν. ἔστι μεριζομενός, ἔστι ἀπολεινομενός, ἔστι μετὰ δαίμωνων ἐκ τοῦ ἐν τοῦ τοῦ, πάντῃ δὲ πάντῃ, καὶ μηδὲν περιεχομενός, ὅλος νῆς, ὅλος φῶς πάσης, ὅλος ὀφθαλμός πάντων, πάντα ἀκῶν, εἰδὼς πάντα, δυνάμει τὰς δυνάμεις ἐρευνῶν. τὴν πάντα ὑπολείπειν ἑστῶτα ἀγγέλων τε καὶ θεῶν. Strom. lib. 7. p. 702.

it is an opinion directly contrary to that of the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, who begins with saying, “ *God who, at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the Fathers by the prophets, has in these last days spoken unto us by his Son.*” According to this, it is evident that God had not spoken to mankind by his Son before the dispensation of the gospel.

As it was Justin Martyr who probably first advanced this doctrine, I shall give from his writings a passage or two in which it is expressed. They occur in his dialogue with Trypho, and were evidently intended to reconcile the Jews to the christian religion. But it was not the method which had been taken by the apostles. They were content to shew from the scriptures that Jesus was the Christ, who *was to come* into the world, and not one that had ever been in it, or acted any part in it, before he was born. “ Bear with me,” says Justin, “ and I will shew you from the book of Exodus, that this is the same who is called an angel; and God, and Lord, and a man, and the man who appeared to Abraham, and to  
“ Isaac,

“ Isaac, and appearing in the form of a  
 “ flame of fire, discoursed with Moses from  
 “ the bush\*.” “ Who is he that is some-  
 “ times called the angel of the great coun-  
 “ cil, a man by Ezekiel, the son of man by  
 “ Daniel, a child by Isaiah, and Christ, and  
 “ God to be worshipped, and David, and  
 “ Christ, and a stone by many, and wisdom  
 “ by Solomon, and Joseph, and Judas. and  
 “ a star by Moses, and ἀνατολή [a branch] by  
 “ Zechariah, and one who was to suffer,  
 “ and Jacob, and Israel again by Isaiah, and  
 “ a rod, and a flower, and a chief corner  
 “ stone, and the Son of God†.” “ As he  
 “ is called the Son of God in the writings  
 “ of the apostles, we understand him to be

\* Ἀνασχέσθε με, ελεγον, καὶ αὐτοῦ τῆς βιβλίας τῆς Ἑξοδῆ, ἀποδεικνύ-  
 οντί ὑμῖν ὡς ὁ αὐτὸς κύριος καὶ ἄγγελος. καὶ θεός, καὶ κύριος, καὶ ἀνὴρ,  
 καὶ ἄνθρωπος Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαάκ φανείς, ἐν πυρὶ φλογος ἐκ βάθου πεφανταί  
 καὶ ὡμίλησε τῷ Μωϋσῃ. Dial. p. 263.

† Τίς δ' ἐστὶν υἱὸς ὁ καὶ ἄγγελος μεγάλης βουλῆς πῶτε, καὶ ἀνὴρ διὰ Ἰεζεκι-  
 ηλ, καὶ ὡς υἱὸς ἄνθρωπου διὰ Δανιήλ, καὶ παῖδιον διὰ Ησαίαν, καὶ χρίτος, καὶ  
 θεὸς προσκυνητός, καὶ Δαβὶδ, καὶ χρίτος, καὶ λῦσις διὰ πολλῶν, καὶ σοφία  
 διὰ Σολομῶνος, καὶ Ἰωσήφ, καὶ Ἰούδας, καὶ ἄστρον διὰ Μωϋσεως, καὶ ἀνατολή  
 διὰ Ζαχαρίας, καὶ παῖς, καὶ Ἰακώβ, καὶ Ἰσραὴλ πάλιν διὰ Ησαίαν, καὶ  
 ραβδός, καὶ ἀντί, καὶ λῦσις ἀποργαζομένη κεκληταί καὶ υἱὸς θεοῦ. Ibid.  
 P. 407.

“ before

“ before all creatures, coming from the  
 “ Father by his power, and at his pleasure,  
 “ who is also called wisdom, and day, and  
 “ a day star, and a sword, and a stone, and a  
 “ staff, and Jacob, and Israel, and in vari-  
 “ ous ways in the writings of the pro-  
 “ phets \*.” “ Our Christ,” he says, “ in  
 “ the form of fire, spake to Moses from the  
 “ bush, and said, put off thy shoes,” &c. †

According to Philo, and the christian philosophers, the logos was not only a teacher, but also the creator of all things; and when this logos was represented as the same with Christ, nothing could give men a higher idea of their crucified master. “ How,” says Chrysostom, “ can any dare  
 “ to call Christ a servant, who did not put  
 “ forth all his strength when he made the

\* Και υιον θες γεγραμμενον αυτον εν τοις απομνημονευμασι των απιστων αυτε εχοντες, η υιον αυτον λεγοντες, νενοηκαμεν οντα η προ παλιν ποιηματα, απο τε παλρῳ δυναμει αυτε η βελη προσελθοντα, ος η σοφια, η ημερα, η αναβολη, η μαχαιρα, η λιθῳ, η ραβδῳ, η Ιακωβ, η Ισραηλ, καὶ αλλον η αλλον τροπον, εν τοις των προφητων λογοις προσηγορευται. Dial. p. 353.

† Εν ιδεα πυρος εκ βαλς προσωμιλησεν αυτω ο ημετερῳ χριστος, και ειπεν, υπολυσαι τα υποδηματια σε, και προσελθων ανησον. Apol. 1. p. 92.

“ world.”

“ world\*.” Tatian says that “ the logos  
 “ before the creation of man, was the maker  
 “ of angels †.”

Methodius very distinctly mentions a middle scheme, supposing, after Philo, that the Father created matter out of nothing, by an act of his will, and that afterwards the Son formed it into worlds. “ There  
 “ are,” he says, “ two creative powers, he  
 “ that by his mere will creates whatever he  
 “ pleases out of nothing, which is the Fa-  
 “ ther; the other, which adorns and per-  
 “ fects what was first produced by the for-  
 “ mer, and in imitation of him. This is  
 “ the Son, the powerful right hand of the  
 “ Father, by which, after he had created  
 “ matter out of nothing, he adorns it ‡.”

\* Πως εν τοις μωσιτινες υπεργον λεγειν τον υιον. ο γαρ μηδε ολκν αυτε την ενεργειαν κινήσας, δε τον υριον εδει ποιησαι. In Pl. 8. Opera, vol. 3. p. 121.

† Ο μεν εν λογος προ της των ανδρων καλασκεινης αγγελων δημιουργος γινεται. Ad Græcos. sect. 10. p. 26.

‡ Δυο δε δυναμεις εν τοις προωμολογημενοις εφαιμεν εναι ποιητικας, την εξ εκ οντων γυνω τω βεληματι χωρις μελισμα, αμα τω βελησται αυτη γυσαν ο βελεται ποιειν · ο τυγχανει δε ο πατηρ. Βαλειραν δε κατακουμυσαν και ποιικιλυσαν κατα μιμησιν της προτερας τα ηδη γεγεννηα · εστι δε ο υιος, η παντοδυναμος και κραλια χειρ τε πατρως, εν η μελα το ποιησαι την υλην εξ εκ οντων καλακοσμει. Photii. Bib. p. 997.

If

If we admit the distinction between *ποιητής* and *δημιουργός* given by Justin Martyr, it may be supposed that all the more early Fathers, who called Christ the *демиургус*, believed that the matter out of which the world was made was provided by the Father \*.

Afterwards it was supposed that the Son was employed in the original creation of matter out of nothing. Thus Tertullian says, “the rule of faith requires us to believe that there is one God, who produced all things out of nothing, by his Son, first emitted from him †.”

To be born of a woman was certainly degrading to this great personage; but the disgrace was in a great measure wiped away, when it was considered that he made the

\* Αναγκαστον δε οισμαι και τω προσεχειν τον νεν, οτι εδε ποιητην αυτου ο Πλατων, αλλα δημιουργον ονομαζει θεων. καιτοι πολλης διαφορας εν τωτοις εστις καια την αυτη Πλατωνος δοξαν. ο μεν γαρ ποιητης, εδενος ερε προσδεομενος, εκ της εαυτη δυναμεως και εξουσιας ποιει το ποιημενον. ο δε δημιουργος, την της δημιουργιας δυναμιν εκ της υλης ειληφως, κατασκευαζει το γενομενον. Ad Græcos. p. 21.

† Regola est autem fidei—qua creditur unum omnina Deum esse—qui universa de nihilo produxerit per verbum suum primo omnium demissum. De Præscriptione. sect. 13. p. 206.



very woman of whom he was born. “If  
 “all things were made by him,” says Austin,  
 “Mary, of whom he was born, was made  
 “by him\*.” His body was also a dis-  
 graceful circumstance; but not so much  
 so when it was considered that he made  
 that very body. Clemens Alexandrinus,  
 speaking of the Son, says, “he forms  
 “himself†.” “The logos, going forth,  
 “was the author of creation, and pro-  
 “duced itself, when it was made flesh,  
 “that it might be seen‡.” “Having  
 “formed to himself a body out of the vir-  
 “gin,” Athanasius says, “he gave no small  
 “proof of his divinity, for he who made  
 “that, did also make all things§.”

As Christ made his own body, so he  
 likewise made his own human soul. “The

\* Si enim omnia per ipsum facta sunt, et ipsa Maria de  
 qua natus est, per ipsum facta est. In Ps. 75. Opera, vol.  
 8. p. 827.

† Και μην εαυτον κηζει και δημιουργει. Strom. lib: 7. p. 706.

‡ Προελθων δε ο λογος, δημιουργιας αιτιος, επειτα και εαυτον γεννα,  
 οταν ο λογος σαρκι γεννηται, ινα και θεωρη. Ibid. lib. 5. p. 553.

§ Εκ παρθενος πλαττει εαυτω το σωμα, ινα μη μικρον της θεοτητος  
 αυτης γνωρισμα πασι παρασχη· οτι ο τριτο πλαστας, αυτος εστι και των  
 αλλων ποιητης. De Incarnatione, Opera, vol. 1. p. 71.

“logos of God,” says Anastasius Sanaita,  
 “when he came to renew Adam, made for  
 “himself such a soul as he first imparted  
 “from himself to Adam, by breathing into  
 “him \*.”

According to the same system, which  
 made Christ the creator of his own body, he  
 likewise raised that body from the grave.  
 “If,” says Athanasius, “when he hung  
 “upon the cross, he raised the bodies of the  
 “saints, when they were dissolved, much  
 “more could he raise his own body, which  
 “he carried about him, being the logos  
 “of the ever living God †.” “He who  
 “quickeneth all the dead quickened the  
 “man Christ Jesus, whom he had as-  
 “sumed ‡.” Eusebius says, that Christ

\* *Επιδημησας εν ο τς θες λογος επι το ανακαινισαι τον Αδαμ. τοι-  
 αυτην εαυτω ψυχην εδημιεργησεν, οταν απαρχης εξ εαυτε δια τς εμφυ-  
 σματος τω Αδαμ μετεδωκεν.* De Hominis Creatione, Ban-  
 dini Collectio, vol. 2. p. 64.

† *Ει γαρ επι σταυρς ων τα προδιαλευθεντα νεκρα των αγιων ηγειρε  
 σωματα· πολλω μαλλον εγειραι δυναται ο εφορεσε σωμα, ο αει ζων  
 θεος λογος.* Opera, vol. 2. p. 542.

‡ *Ο γαρ παντας τς νεκρς ζωοποιων, και τον εκ Μαρίας ανθρωπον  
 χριστον Ιησυν εξωοποίησεν, ον ανειληφεν.* Sermo Major de Fide in  
 Montfaucon's Collectio, vol. 2. p. 6.

raised his own body, being the right hand and power of the Father \*. This Paulinus supposed to have been foretold by Jacob, when he compared Judah to a lion. “ The  
 “ same Lord is the lion who conquered, and  
 “ the lion’s whelp, who went to sleep of  
 “ his own accord, and raised himself up, of  
 “ whom it is written, Who shall raise him  
 “ up †.”

But according to Origen, he was raised to life by God the Father, “ the same,” he says; “ whom Christ honoured as the God  
 “ of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and whom  
 “ he called not the God of the dead, but of  
 “ the living ‡.”

The logos of the Father having now assumed a proper personal character, and be-

\* Και αυτος το εαυτε ανεστησε σωμα, δεξια και δυναμις ων τε πα-  
 τρος. In Pl. Montfaucon’s Collectio, vol. 1. p. 701.

† Idem enim dominus et leo ille, qui vicit et catulus est leonis, sua sponte sopitus, et a semetipso resuscitatus, de quo scriptum est: Quis suscitabit eum? Ad Severum, Ep. 4. Opera, p. 53.

‡ Ου γαρ υπ αλλε ισασιν εκ νεκρων ευηγερμενον Ιησυν θεο, η τε-  
 των πατερων. ον και ο χριστος δοξαζων θεον τε Αβρααμ, και Ισαακ,  
 και Ιακωβ φησιν, ειναι, εκ οντων νεκρων, αλλα ζωντων. In Johan.  
 Comment. vol. 2. p. 183.

ing inseparably united with the man Jesus, a new and immense field of speculation is opened unto us; and great scope was given to the ingenuity of those who maintained so complex and so extraordinary a system. Christ was now a three-fold being, consisting of the divine *logos*, a human *soul*, and a human *body*; and the combination of all the powers peculiar to each of these component parts was certainly in great danger of considerably affecting them all, some being lowered and others raised.

Considering Christ as one compound being, it was generally agreed that he held a middle rank between the supreme God and the creatures. Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, says that “Christ, by whom God  
“ made all things, is called a middle nature  
“ between the Father who is unbegotten,  
“ and the creatures \*.”

Theophilus, following Philo, says, that  
“ the Father is not confined to place, but

\* *Αγνοεῖται οἱ ἀνασκητοί, ὡς μακρὸν ἀν εἴη μέλαξυ πάρος ἀγεννήτε καὶ τῶν κτισθέντων ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἐξ ἐκ οὐλῶν, λογικῶν τε καὶ ἀλογῶν, ὧν μεσίτευσα φύσις μονογενής, δι’ ἧς τὰ ὅλα ἐξ ἐκ οὐλῶν ἐποίησεν ὁ πατήρ τε θεὸς λόγος.* Theodoriti Hist. lib. 1. cap. 4. p. 17.

“ that

“ that the logos, by which he made all  
 “ things, being his power and wisdom, as-  
 “ suming the character of the Father, and  
 “ Lord of all, was present in Paradise, in  
 “ the character of God \*.”

Bishop Bull acknowledges that Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Novatian thought that the Father could not be confined to place, but that the Son might †.

Methodius calls Christ the oldest of the æons, and the chief of the archangels ‡.

• Αὐτὸς ὁ φημί· ὁ μὲν θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τῶν ὅλων ἀχωρήτος ἐστίν, καὶ ἐν τόπῳ οὐκ εὐρισκείται· καὶ γὰρ ἐστὶ τόπος τῆς κατὰ παύσεως αὐτοῦ· ὁ δὲ λόγος αὐτοῦ δι' ἑτα πάντα πέποιηκε, δυνάμει ὧν καὶ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ, ἀναλαμβάνων τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου τῶν ὅλων, ἑὶς παρέγενετο εἰς τὸν παραδείσον ἐν πρόσωπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ.  
 Lib. 2. p. 129.

† Defensio. sect. 4. cap. 3. p. 236.

‡ Ἦν γὰρ πρεσβυτάτον τὸν πρεσβυτάτον τῶν αἰῶνων καὶ πρῶτον τῶν ἀρχαγγέλων ἀνθρώποις μέλλων συνομιλεῖν εἰς τὸν πρεσβυτάτον καὶ πρῶτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰσοικισθῆναι. De Convivio Virginum, p. 79.

## C H A P T E R VI.

*Christ, beside being the Logos of the Father, was thought to have a proper human Soul.*

AS Christ reasoned and conversed like other men, it might have been thought that he had only one reasoning intelligent principle within him, whatever that had been. But it is remarkable, that all the Fathers till the time of Arius held that Christ had a proper human soul, as well as a human body; which, of itself, affords a strong presumption, that the ancient opinion was, that of Christ being a mere man, without any pre-existent soul at all. Had the generally received opinion been, that the soul of Christ was a great pre-existent spirit, they who aimed at nothing more than advancing the rank and power of that spirit, would not have thought it necessary to give Christ another soul (one being sufficient for all the purposes of intelligence) and whatever this soul had been capable of before, it might have done afterwards.

Since,

Since, therefore, the philosophizing christians did not proceed in this manner, it is plain that they had a different foundation to build upon. They found the popular opinion to be, that Christ was *a man*; and the received opinion of that age was, that a man consisted of two parts, viz. soul and body. What they said, therefore, at first, was, as I have shewn, little more than all christians had supposed, and what might be considered as only a different way of expressing the same thing. The common people believed that the man Jesus was under the direction and influence of the spirit and power of God, and the philosophers among them supposed that the divine spirit, which they called the *logos*, was attached, and inseparably united, to the man Jesus. They would say, that this was only the same *principle*, or *power*, by which God made the world, and inspired the ancient prophets; and the common people would not know how to object to this.

Accordingly, it does not appear, that the common people were alarmed at this

new doctrine, till those who had advanced it proceeded one step farther, and maintained, that in consequence of this intimate and permanent union of the divine logos to the man Jesus, he might be called *God*. Still, however, they were particularly careful to represent this *new God* as greatly inferior to the Supreme Being, and as having no divinity, but what he derived from him ; and, therefore, might still be called *his*. In this manner, we have seen, they endeavoured to turn off the force of the popular objections.

When, afterwards, the Arians supposed the logos that was in Christ to be a *created being*, and not the proper logos, or *reason of the Father*, they naturally dropped the notion of Christ having a human soul ; and at this, as being quite a *novel* opinion, the orthodox made loud exclamations. Had the ancient doctrine, therefore, been, that the logos was a creature, the notion of Christ having a human soul would never have been adopted.

It is evident, that the christian writers never speak of more than *one logos*, and this .  
was



was the *logos*, or wisdom of the Father, and *uncreated*. Whether, therefore, they thought that this *logos* could be so far united to a man, as to partake of his sufferings (which some of them probably did) or they did not, it is evident that it could not be a human soul. Besides, had there been any such difference of opinion among the Fathers, as that some of them should have held that the *logos* in Christ was uncreated, while others held that it was created; if some of them should have maintained that it was the proper wisdom and power of the Father, and others that it was a spirit so far similar to a human soul, as to be capable of a proper union with a human body, and of all the functions of other souls, there would certainly have been a discussion of the question. Considering how attentive christians actually were to every opinion concerning the person of Christ, from the time of the apostles to that of the council of Nice, as well as afterwards, a difference of opinion of this magnitude

would

would certainly have excited as much controversy before the time of Arius as it did after his time.

Since, therefore, it is evident from their writings, that all the Fathers before the council of Nice, who mention the *logos* at all, had the same idea of it, and there was no controversy among them on the subject (though they were highly offended at the notion of the Gnostics, whose *Christ* very much resembled the *Arian logos*) it may be presumed, *a priori*, that they did not differ with respect to the other constituent parts of Christ, but that whatever opinion was clearly held by some of them, was held by them all. And there is this farther probability in favour of it, that there was no more controversy among them about the *soul of Christ*, than there was about the *logos*.

That Christ had a human soul, was clearly, as I shall now proceed to show, the opinion of all the orthodox Fathers before the council of Nice. Clemens Romanus says, “ Christ gave his own blood for us by  
“ the

“ the will of God, his flesh for our flesh, his  
 “ soul for our souls\*.” Justin Martyr  
 says, “ Our doctrine is more sublime than  
 “ any thing that was ever taught by man,  
 “ as the whole of the rational being, Christ,  
 “ who appeared for us, consisted of a *body*,  
 “ the *logos*, and a *soul*†.”

Irenæus unquestionably had the idea of  
 Christ having a human *soul*, as well as a  
 body. In describing the whole person of  
 Christ, he represents it as the union of *God*  
*and man*, and not of the *logos* and the body  
 of a man only. “ The prophets,” he says,  
 “ preached his coming according to the  
 “ flesh, by which he was made a mixture  
 “ and union of God and man‡.” He al-

\* Εν αγαπη προσελαβέτο ημας ο θεοτόκης δια την αγα-  
 πην ην εχεν προς ημας, το αιμα αυτε εδωκεν υπερ ημων ο  
 χριστος ο κυριος ημων, εν θεληματι θεου, και την σαρκα υπερ  
 της σαρκος ημων, και την ψυχην υπερ των ψυχων ημων.  
 Sect. 49. p. 175.

† Μεγαλειοτερα μεν εν πασης ανθρωπειη διδασκαλιας  
 φαινεται τα ημετερα δια τοσο λογικον το ολον [δια το λο-  
 γικον ολον] τον φανελα δι ημας χριστον γεγονεναι και σωμα  
 και λογον και ψυχην. Apol. 2. p. 123.

‡ Prophetæ— prædicaverunt ejus secundum carnem  
 adventum, per quem commixtio et communio dei et ho-  
 minis—facta est. Lib. 4. cap. 37. p. 331.

ways supposes man to consist of two parts *soul* and *body*, and expressly speaks of Christ as having both. "If Christ," he says, "was not what we are, it is of little consequence that he suffered. We consist of a *body* which is from the earth, and a *soul* from the breath of God. The word of God therefore took this, his own work, upon himself, and on this account confesses himself to be the Son of man\*."

He speaks of Christ as being three days in the place where the dead are, preaching to the souls there †; and he could not think that such a *logos* as he describes could

\* Si hoc non factus est quod nos eramus, non magnum faciebat quod passus est et sustinuit. Nos autem, quoniam corpus sumus de terra acceptum, et anima accipiens adeo spiritum, omnis quicumque confitebitur. Hoc itaque factum est verbum Dei, suum plasma in semetipsum recapitulans, et propter hoc filium hominis se confitetur. Lib. 3. cap. 33. p. 260.

† Tribus diebus conversatus est ubi erant mortui.— Et propter hoc Dominum in ea quæ sunt sub terra descendisse, evangelizantem et illis adventum suum remissam peccatorum existentem his qui credunt in eum. Lib. 5. cap. 35, p. 451. Lib. 4. cap. 45. p. 346.

have

have been particularly in that place. For he considered the *logos* not as any thing that was *created*, but what had always existed with God. “Thou, O man,” says he, “art  
“ not uncreated, nor didst thou co-exist  
“ with God, like his own word\*.”

In answer to the Gnostics, who said that it was *Jesus* only, and not *the Christ* that suffered, he says, indeed, that in the account of our Saviour’s sufferings in the scriptures, the word *Christ* is made use of†. But when he explains himself more fully, he says, it was *the man* only that suffered, the *logos* being quiescent at that time.  
“ As he was man that he might be tempted,  
“ so he was the *logos* that he might be  
“ glorified; the *logos* being quiescent in  
“ his temptation, crucifixion, and death, but  
“ being present with the man, in his vic-  
“ tory, patience, kindness, resurrection, and  
“ ascension‡.”

\* Non enim infectus es, O homo, nec semper co-existebas Deo, sicut proprium ejus verbum. Lib. 2. cap. 43. p. 169.

† Πανταχθ επι τα παθη τα κυρια ημων και της ανθρωποτητος αυτης τω τα χριστε κεχρηται ονοματι. Lib. 3. cap. 20. p. 246.

‡ Ωσπερ γαρ ην ανθρωπος ινα πειρασθαι, ζιω και λογι ινα διξασθαι\* ησυχαστονος μεν τα λογα εν τω πειρασθαι, και ταυρασθαι, και  
αποδνησκειν

It is sufficiently evident that Novatian believed Christ to have a soul as well as the *logos*, this being God, a principle properly *divine*, which could not suffer or die. “If the immortal soul in other persons,” he says, “could not be killed, how much less could the word of God, and God in Christ, be killed—From this,” he says, “may be inferred, that it was only the man in Christ that was killed, and that the word could not become mortal.” As he had just before observed that in man the body only can die, he would naturally have used the term *body* with respect to Christ, and not that of *man in him*, if he had not believed that besides the *logos*, Christ consisted of a compleat man, soul and body\*.

αποθνήσκειν \* συγγινόμενός δὲ ἐν τῷ νικᾶν. καὶ ὑπομένειν, καὶ χρηστεύεσθαι, καὶ ἀνίστασθαι, καὶ ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι Lib. 3. cap. 21. p. 250.

\* Quod si anima immortalis occidi aut interfici non potest in quovis alio licet (cum scilicet) corpus et caro sola possit interfici, quanto magis utique verbum Dei, et Deus in Christo, interfici omnino non potuit; cum caro sola et corpus occisum sit—Per hæc colligitur non nisi hominem in Christo interfectum appareat, ad mortalitatem sermonem in loco (in illo) non esse deductum. Cap. 25. p. 194. Ed. Jackson.

Tertullian

Tertullian always supposes the same. Speaking of Christ's saying, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me," "this voice," says he, "was from the flesh, and the soul, that is, the man, and not of the word or the spirit, that is, not of the God; and was uttered to shew that God was impassible, who thus left the Son, and gave up his man to death\*. In Christ," he says, "writing against the Gnostics, we find a soul and flesh in plain and express terms; that is, the soul is a soul, and the flesh flesh. Had the soul been flesh, or the flesh a soul, they ought to have been so called†."

Origen, who has been supposed to be a favourer of Arianism, exactly follows these

\* Sed hæc vox carnis et animæ, id est hominis: non sermonis; nec spiritus, id est non Dei, propterea emissæ est, ut impassibilem Deum ostenderit, qui sic filium dereliquit, dum hominem ejus tradidit in mortem. Ad Præxeam, sect. 30. p. 518.

† In Christo vero invenimus animam et carnem, simplicibus et nudis vocabulis editas; id est, animam animam, et carnem carnem; nusquam animam carnem, aut carnem animam: quando ita nominari debuissent. De carne Christi, sect. 15. p. 318.





“him learn, that the logos, remaining  
 “essentially the logos, suffers nothing of  
 “what the body or the soul feels\*.” In  
 his Commentaries on Matthew, he says, that  
 “Christ increased in wisdom with respect  
 “to his human soul†.”

Socrates the historian, giving an account  
 of a synod held at Alexandria, at which  
 Athanasius attended, says, “It was there  
 “agreed, that when Christ became incar-  
 “nate, he took not only flesh, but also the  
 “soul of man, which was the opinion of  
 “all the ancient divines. For they did not  
 “think that they were introducing a new  
 “doctrine into the church, but what was  
 “agreeable to ecclesiastical tradition among  
 “christian philosophers. This was the  
 “doctrine of all the ancient writers, who  
 “have mentioned the subject. For cer-  
 “tainly Irenæus, Clemens, Apollinarius of

\* Εἰ δὲ καὶ σῶμα θνητὸν καὶ ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπινην ἀναλαβὼν ὁ ἀθανάτου  
 θεὸς λόγος δοκεῖ τῷ Κέλσῳ ἀλλαττεῖσθαι καὶ μεταπίπτειν. μανθανεῖται  
 οὖν ὁ λόγος τῇ ἐξίστα μὲνων λόγος ἔθεν μὲν πασχει ὡς πασχει τὸ σῶμα  
 ἢ ψυχή. Lib 4. p. 170.

† Καὶ εἶω γε ἀκρῶς περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας ἀναλαβόντος ἀνθρώπινην  
 ψυχὴν τοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς προεκοπτεν, Vol. 1. p. 330.

“ Hierapolis, and Serapion bishop of An-  
 “ tioch, shew by their writings, that they  
 “ considered it as a thing universally ac-  
 “ knowledged, that when Christ became  
 “ incarnate he had a soul. The council  
 “ which was assembled on the account  
 “ of Beryllus, of Alexandria in Arabia in  
 “ their letters to Beryllus, shew the same  
 “ thing; and Origen frequently, in his  
 “ writings, acknowledged Christ to have a  
 “ soul \*.”

Indeed, as I have observed, had some of the Fathers had one opinion on this subject, and some another, it could not have failed to occasion a discussion of the point,

\* Καὶ τὸν ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, ἔ μόνον ἐνσαρκιον. ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐμφυχωμένον ἀπεφηναντες, ἡ καὶ πάλαι τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἔδοκει. ἔ γὰρ νεαρὰν τινὰ ὁρησκεῖαν ἐπινοήσαντες εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν εἰσηγάγον, ἀλλὰ ἀπερ' ἐξ ἀρχῆς καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησιαστικὴ παράδοσις ἔλεγε καὶ ἀποδεικτικῶς παρὰ τοῖς χριστιανῶν σοφοῖς ἐφίλοσοφείτο. εἶτο γὰρ πάντες οἱ παλαιότεροι περὶ τῆς λόγον γυμνασάντες, ἐγέγραφον ἡμῖν κατελείπον. καὶ γὰρ Εἰρηναῖος τε καὶ Κλήμης. Ἀπολινάριος τε ὁ Ἰεραπεκλίνης καὶ Σαραπίων ὁ τῆς ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ προεστῶ ἐκκλησίας, ἐμφυχον τὸν ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, ἐν τοῖς πωνηθείσιν αὐτοῖς λόγοις ὡς ὁμολογούμενον αὐτοῖς φάσκουσιν. ἔ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ διὰ Βηρύλλον τὸν φιλαδελφείας τῆς ἐν Ἀραβίᾳ ἐπισκοπὸν γενομένη συνόδος γράφεσα Βηρύλλῳ τὰ αὐτὰ παραδέδωκεν. Ὁριγενὴς δὲ πάντα καὶ μὲν ἐν τοῖς φερόμενοις αὐτῆς βιβλίοις, ἐμφυχον τὸν ἐνανθρωπήσαντα οἶδεν. Lib.3. cap. 7. p. 178.

and

and warm controversy, before the time of Arius. It is to this day, also, the received opinion of all those who are called orthodox, that Christ has a proper human soul, and the Arians still are the only christians who deny this.

As this doctrine of Christ having a proper human soul, together with that of the real origin and nature of the *logos*, is of so much consequence to the system of Arianism, I have carefully attended to every thing that I could find to have been advanced by any Arians on the subject. But to my great surprize, I have hardly found that it has been so much as noticed by them, except by Mr. Whiston, who, in his *Collection of ancient Monuments relating to the Trinity*, without mentioning any other authority whatever, infers from there being no express mention of a human soul in Christ in two particular treatises of Athanasius, viz. that *against the Gentiles*, and that *on the Incarnation*, that “this Father seems  
“ as if he had never heard of such a no-  
“ tion among christians at all.” P. 74. He adds, “ I solemnly appeal to the unbiaſſed

“ reader, after he has carefully perused the  
“ whole discourse, whether he can believe  
“ that Athanasius owned a human rational  
“ soul, as assumed by the word at the in-  
“ carnation, when he wrote that treatise.”  
He then concludes with asserting, that “ the  
“ acknowledgment of a human and ra-  
“ tional soul in Christ, distinguished from  
“ his divine nature, was one of the last  
“ branches of the Athanasian heresy.”

That this writer was aware of the importance of this fact is very evident. “ It is  
“ indisputable,” he says, “ and is agreed  
“ on by all, that in case our Saviour did  
“ not assume a human rational soul at his in-  
“ carnation, the common orthodoxy cannot  
“ possibly be defended.” But if he did, the Arian hypothesis must fall to the ground.

Now, certainly, it cannot follow that because express mention is not made of the human soul of Christ in two particular treatises, that the author did not allow, and had not even heard of such a thing. Indeed, I do not see that Athanasius had any particular occasion to mention it in these treatises. For it was the *body of Christ*, and  
the

the infirmities of such a body, that was the great objection to christianity, which he was endeavouring to answer; and therefore he dwells upon the necessity of Christ taking such a body. But in several parts of these very treatises, and even some of those that are marked by Mr. Whiston himself, as most favourable to his own conclusion, the human soul of Christ seems to be hinted at; as when the *logos* is said to have assumed, or to have been united to *the man*, or *human nature* in general, and not the body in particular. “When human nature “was gone astray,” he says, “the word “took possession of it, and appeared as a “man, that he might save it from its dangerous state, by his governing power and “goodness\*.”

But what is sufficiently decisive in favour of Athanasius, as well as all his predecessors believing that Christ had a proper human soul is that the *logos*, according to his and their description of it, could not supply the

\* Τι απιστον λεγείναι ποτε ημιν, ει, πλανωμενης της ανθρωπότητος, εγκαθισεν ο λογος επι ταυτην η ανθρωπος επιφανη, ινα χειμαζομενην αυτην περισωσῃ δια της κυβερνησεως αυτης η αγαθητης. P. 97

place of one, because it was the proper *wisdom of the Father*, and consequently incapable of suffering, which was always supposed to be one end of the incarnation. The following are descriptions of the *logos*, in these very treatises, and in Mr. Whiston's own translation.

“ But God the word was not of this nature in man ; for he was not bound fast to the body, but did himself rather hold it together, when he was therein ; and also was at the same time present to all things, and was without the beings that exist, and rested alone in his Father \*.”

“ He is the good product of a good being, and the true Son, and is therefore the power, wisdom, and word of the Father ; and is not such by participation. Nor are those qualities external, or adventitious to him, as is the case of those that are partakers of them, and are instructed by him, and become powerful and rational through him. But he is pe-

\* Ου γαρ συνεβλεβητο τῷ σώματι ἀλλὰ μάλλον αὐτὸς ἐκρατεῖ τὰς , ὥς ἐ καὶ ἐν τῷ πν καὶ ἐν τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐτυγχάνει, καὶ ἐξω τῶν ὄντων πν, καὶ ἐν μόνῳ τῷ πατρὶ ἀνεπαύετο. Sect. 17. p. 70.

“culiarly the real wisdom, the real word,  
“the real power of the Father, &c. \*”

Athanasius, moreover, in the treatise on the incarnation, expressly says, that the logos was incapable of suffering, as indeed being of a divine nature it could never be supposed to be. “He himself was not  
“hurt at all, as being impassible and the  
“real word of God †.”

It is acknowledged that Justin Martyr and Irenæus (but I do not know that it is true of any others) speak of the *logos suffering*. The former says, that “the logos was  
“preached as suffering ‡.” And the latter says “the logos of God became flesh, and  
“suffered ||.” But as both these writers supposed that Christ had a human soul,

\* Καὶ ὅτι ἀγαθὸν ἐξ ἀγαθῆς γενήματα, καὶ ἀληθινὸς υἱὸς ὑπαρχὼν, δυνάμεις ἐστὶ τῆ πατρὸς, καὶ σοφία, καὶ λόγος, & κατὰ μετοχὴν ταῦτα ὧν, ὅθεν ἐξῶθεν ἐπιγινόμενων τῶν αὐτῶν κατὰ τὰς αὐτὰς μετεχούτων καὶ ὀφειζομένων δι’ αὐτῆς, καὶ δυνατῆς καὶ λογικῆς ἐν αὐτῷ γινόμενῆς, ἀλλ’ αὐτοσοφία, αὐτολόγος, αὐτοδυναμὶς ἰδίᾳ τῆ πατρὸς, ἐστίν. Ad Gentes, p. 51.

† Ἐβλάπτετο μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸς δὲν, ἀπαθὴς καὶ ἀφθάρτος, καὶ αὐτολόγος ὢν, καὶ θεός. Sect. 54. p. 108.

‡ Κερυχθέντα δι’ αὐτῶν παθόντα λόγον. Dial. In Jackson on Novatian, p. 357.

|| Διατί ὁ λόγος σαρκὶ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐπαθὲν. Lib. 1. cap. 4. P. 47.

proper for suffering, it is most probable that they only used the term *logos* in these places, as synonymous to *Christ* (that being in their opinion the most honourable part of him) whose soul and body only really suffered. This may be concluded with certainty to have been the case with respect to Irenæus, who expressly says, that the *logos* was *quiescent* in the sufferings of Christ; and therefore we can hardly doubt, but that Justin also, if he had had any occasion to explain himself on the subject, would have said the same.

It is possible, however, though not probable, that some persons might imagine, that the *logos*, being intimately united to the soul and body of a man, might, in some sense, partake in their sufferings. But as both these writers held that Christ had a human soul, it is evident that they did not consider the *sufferings of the logos*, in whatever sense they might use that expression, as implying that a human soul was not necessary to Christ; and, therefore, I do not see how Arians can derive any advantage from it, as used by them.

Also,



Also, to make Irenæus consistent with himself, we must suppose that when, in opposition to the Gnostics, he said that it was *Christ* and not *Jesus* only that suffered, he only meant to say, that there was no such super-angelic being as they held, which flew away from Jesus when he was upon the cross; but that the *logos*, which had been united to him before, continued still united to him, even in his sufferings, though he did not properly partake of them. This agrees with his saying that the *logos* was *quiescent* in his sufferings, meaning perhaps that he did not interpose to prevent, or alleviate them.

Mr. Jackson considers these casual expressions of Justin Martyr and Irenæus as circumstances by which we may discover the true doctrine of the apostolic age\*. But this is a conjecture unsupported by any other fact or circumstance whatever. And it is highly improbable, on several accounts, that christians of the apostolic age should have supposed that Christ had no other

\* Adnotationes in Novatianum, p. 356.

than a created soul, and that this soul was the *logos*, and that all the writers from that time till the council of Nice should invariably hold that the *logos* was *uncreated*, and that Christ had a human soul besides the *logos*, without any discussion of the subject, without any controversy; when it is known that, from the first appearance of the Gnostics, all the christian world were so attentive to every opinion concerning the person of Christ.

Origen, Tertullian, and others, who wrote not long after Irenæus, expressly say that the *logos* could not suffer, as Irenæus himself says in effect; and they write in such a manner on the subject, as if they considered it to be the universal opinion. It may be presumed therefore, that these writers did not imagine that Justin Martyr, or any other christian writer held any other opinion on the subject.

Mr. Jackson might have found much stronger language than what he has quoted from Justin Martyr, or Irenæus, concerning the suffering of Christ as God, in Cassian, and others who wrote in the Nestorian controversy

troverſy (as will be ſeen when I conſider that ſubject) and yet when they were charged with aſſerting that the *logos* itſelf really ſuffered, they ſtrongly diſclaim having had any ſuch meaning. Cyril of Alexandria ſays, “ they were charged with aſſerting that the “ *logos* ſuffered, but that no one was ever ſo “ mad as to ſuppoſe it\*.” What Cyril here ſays of himſelf and his friends, was, I doubt not, true of Juſtin Martyr, who ſpeaks as highly of the *logos* as Cyril or any chriſtian writer whatever, making it to have been an attribute of the Father; and therefore he muſt have thought it to be as incapable of proper ſuffering, as the Father himſelf.

It will likewise appear highly improbable, that any perſons near the apoſtolic age ſhould have conſidered Chriſt as having a *created logos* in the place of a human ſoul, if it be conſidered, that the opinion of all

\* Proæmium vero in maledicta ab hæreticis tanquam acerbe facta invehitur, et velut offendere conatur, corpus eſſe quod paſſum eſt, non Deus verbum, quæſi ſint qui dicant verbum Dei, quod nulli eſt paſſioni obnoxium, paſſioni eſſe ſubjectum. Sed nemo uſque adeo inſanit, ut hoc dicat. Epist. 6. Opera, vol. 2. p. 17.

the Jews at the time of the promulgation of the gospel was, that the Messiah was a *mere man*, and that the apostles did not, for some time at least, preach any other doctrine, as will be abundantly proved in its proper place. How, then, was there time, in the nature of things, for the christian world in general to have passed from this opinion, first to that of Christ having had a pre-existent soul, capable of creating all things; then, before the time of Justin Martyr, have imagined that soul to have been *uncreated*, the proper logos or wisdom of the Father, and again to have super-added a proper human soul, such as they first began with to this logos. The very mention of such an hypothesis as this is, I should think, sufficient to expose it.

Upon the whole, I cannot help thinking that there is the strongest evidence that the Antenicene Fathers believed that Christ had a proper human soul, as well as a human body; their logos being such as could not supply the place of it, being that *power* which, at the very time that it was incarnate, supported all things, and was even

then as much in the Father as ever it had been. Consequently, those Fathers could not have been Arians.

That the soul which the Fathers ascribed to Christ, beside the *logos*, was a proper human soul, and not merely the *sensitive soul* of some philosophers, is evident from *the man* being said by them to consist of this *soul* and a *body*, a kind of definition in which the term *soul* always expressed every thing belonging to a man that was not body. This will have been observed to be the case with respect to Irenæus.

Those philosophers who, following the principles of Plato, maintained that man has *two souls*, gave Christ two souls also, and disposed of them according to their respective natures. “Christ,” said Theophylact, “was in paradise not only as God, “ but also in his rational and intellectual “ soul; and the animal soul only was in “ hell\*.”

\* Και γαρ ὁ μόνον καθὼς Θεὸς ἦν ἐν τῷ πᾶραδεισῳ, ἀλλ’ ἔτι καθὼς ἀνθρωπινὴν ψυχὴν προσελάβειτο λογικὴν ἢ νοερὰν, ἔτι ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ

To the soul of Christ Origen gave the peculiar power of quitting its body, and returning to it again, whenever it pleased; meaning, that the *logos* dismissed the soul, and re-united it to the body. “Christ,” says he, “did not die according to the common course of nature, but by the exertion of a power given him by God for that purpose†.” He says, that his soul both left the body, and returned to it again at his own pleasure‡.” The same sentiment is also advanced by Cyprian, who says, that “Christ being crucified, preventing the office of the execu-

γεγονε μελα τε νοος. κ̅ εις αὐτ̅ κατηλθε μελα ψυχης. In. Luc. cap. 23. Opera, vol. 1. p. 535.

† Ελεγε δε ο εμος Ιησους περι της εαυτης ψυχης (ε καλα το ανθρωπιον χρεων χωριζομενης τε σωματος, αλλα καλα την δοθεισαν αυτω κ̅ περι τελ̅ παραδοξ̅ον εξεσιαν) το, εδεις αιρει την ψυχην με απο εμε, αλλα ελω τιθημι αυτην απ̅ εμαυτης. Ad Celsum, lib. 2. p. 130.

‡ Και περι την εαυτης τελευτην ειχε τι πλεον · ινα ενεστα μεν το σωμα καλαλιπη η ψυχη, οικονομησαμενη δε τινα εξω αυτης, παλιν επανελθη ο̅ι̅ε β̅η̅λ̅αι · τ̅ι̅θ̅ι̅ον δ̅ αναγεγραπ̅ται παρα τω Ιωαννη ειρημεναι ο Ιησους λογον, εν τω, εδεις αιρει την ψυχην με απ̅ εμε, αλλ̅ εγω τιθημι αυτην απ̅ εμαυτης. Εξεσιαν εχω θειναι αυτην, κ̅ παλιν εξεσιαν εχω λαβειν αυτην. Ibid. lib. 2. p. 70.

“tioner,

“tioner, of his own accord dismissed his  
 “spirit, and on the third day he, of his  
 “own accord, rose from the dead \*.” This  
 doctrine is still held by many modern  
 Arians, though it is highly derogatory  
 from the character of Christ, and destroys  
 the force of his example, in suffering; as  
 it supposes that he had a power of putting  
 an end to his torments, and consequently  
 of lessening the agony of them, which his  
 followers had not.

Anastafius Sanaïta says, that Christ gave  
 his soul a peculiar privilege, above that  
 which was given to Adam, which was only  
 “the breath of God. For the soul of  
 “Immanuel had its essence in God, with  
 “God, and like God †.”

\* Nam et crucifixus, prævento carnificis officio spiritum sponte dimisit, et die tertio rursus a mortuis sponte surrexit. De Idolorum Vanitate, p. 16.

† Η μὲν γὰρ τῆς Ἀδὰμ ψυχὴ ἐκ θεοῦ τὴν ὑπαρξίν διὰ τῆς ἐμφυση-  
 μαίως εἶσεν. ἡ δὲ τῆς Ἐμμανουὴλ ψυχὴ ἐνθεὸν, καὶ συνθεὸν, καὶ ὁμοθεὸν  
 ζῶσιν εἶσεν. Ibid. p. 66.

## CHAPTER VII.

*Of the Union between the Logos, and the Soul and Body of Christ, and their separate properties.*

## SECTION I.

*Of this Union in general.*

SEVERAL curious questions may be started with respect to the union between the divine logos and the soul and body of Christ. For this union was always represented as being equally strict with that which subsists between the soul and body of man; the maxim being, that as the soul and body make one man, so God and man make one Christ. Austin says, “God mixed  
“with man makes Christ, as the soul and  
“body make a man\*.” On this system, a

\* Sicut in unitate personæ anima unitur corpori ut homo sit, ita in unitate personæ Deus unitur homini, ut Christus sit.



considerable difficulty occurred. It was a maxim that the properties of divinity could not be impaired by any circumstance whatever, the divine nature being absolutely unchangeable. It was, therefore, contrary to all reason, supposed that the human nature was a gainer by the union, and the divine nature no loser. “Christ,” says Eusebius, “imparted of his divine nature to man, but “did not receive the properties of mortal “nature\*.” This he compares to the sun, the light of which is not contaminated by shining on dirty objects. In this indeed he had not a view to the body of Christ in particular, but to *human nature* in general, which was benefited by the union of *divinity*, while this was no loser; but there can be no doubt but he had the same idea with respect to the union of the logos to a single man. They did not however, suppose that the human nature of Christ was materially changed by its union with

fit. Quomodo est enim unus homo anima et corpus, sic unus Christus verbum et homo. In Johan. Tr. 48. Opera, vol. 9. p. 349.

\* Αλλα τα μεν εξ αυτης παραδιδες τω ανθρωπω, τα δ' εκ της θνητης μη αυτηλαμβανων. De Laudibus Const. p. 761.

the divine nature. “As the introduction of fire,” says Basil, “does not alter the property of iron, so the divinity makes no change in the body of Christ\*.”

When the doctrine was more advanced, it was maintained that “the whole of the divinity of Christ was united to the whole of the humanity, and not part to part,” as we read in Damascenus†. This was agreeable to the established maxim with respect to the union between the soul and body of man.

So very different were the divine and human natures of Christ conceived to be, and yet so necessary was it, for the purpose of the orthodox christian Fathers, to make an *union* between them, that no embarrassment or discordance of opinion among them can

\* Πως εν. φησι της σωματικης ασθενειας ο θεος λογος εν ενεπλησθη φαιμεν, ως εδε το πυρ των τε σιδηρε ιδιωμάτων μεϊλαμδανει. μελας ο σιδηρος κ' ψυχρος· αλλ' ομως πυρακλωθεις την τε πυρος μορφην υποδυσται, αυτος λαιμπρυνομενος εχι μελαινων το πυρ, κ' αυτος εκφλογεμενος εκ αποψυχων την φλογα. Hom. 25. Opera, vol. 1. p. 507.

† In incarnatione unius ex sanctæ trinitatis personis Dei verbi, totam ac perfectam divinitatis naturam cum tota humana natura copulatam fuisse dicimus, ac non partem cum parte. Orthod. Fid. lib. 3. cap. 5. Opera, p. 375.

surprise.

surprise us. Epiphanius must have considered the soul of Christ as having had but little proper union with his divinity, when he supposed that while he was on the cross the former prayed to the latter\*. Fulgentius says that, “when the human nature of Christ suffered, the divine nature did not even feel compassion, any more than the soul of Christ died when the body did †.” The same writer, however, supposes that, though the soul of Christ did not know the Father, it had a perfect knowledge of the divinity of the Son, with which it made one person ‡.

As a man consists of two parts, it was necessary, in order to complete this system,

\* Ως εν η κινήσει εως εγενετο, απο προσωπου της ενανθρωπησιως, η φωνη ελεγεν αυτη τη ιδια θεοτητι • θεε με, θεε με, ινα με εγκλινητες. Hær. 69. p. 789.

† Et in homine toto patiens, non est divina natura compassa, sicut moriente carne, non solum deitas, sed nec anima Christi potest ostendi commortua. Ad Trasimundum, lib. 3. cap. 18. p. 471.

‡ Et quia unigenitus Deus æqualis est patri, nec potest totum nosse filium, qui totum non noverit patrem, caveamus, ne cum anima Christi totum patrem nosse non creditur, ipse uni Christo ex aliqua parte, non solum patris, sed etiam sui, et spiritus sancti cognitio denegetur. Quam vero

that the *logos* should be united to the body, as well as to the soul of Christ. Accordingly we read, in the account of the embassy to the Armenians. That “the divinity of Christ was never separated from his body, or his soul\*.” Even the death of the body was not supposed to break this union. “The divinity of Christ,” says Damascenus, “was not separated from the body of Christ even in death. Even in that state, all the three made but one hypostasis, Neither the soul nor the body had any peculiar hypostasis of its own. It was only the hypostasis of Christ†.”

*perdurus est, et a sanitate fidei penitus alienum, ut dicamus animam Christi non plenam suæ deitatis habere notitiam, cum qua naturaliter unam creditur habere personam*  
Ad Ferrandum, Qu. 3. p. 627.

\* Quum ergo divinitas ejus nunquam nec a corpore, nec ab anima dirempta fuit Bib. Pat. App. p. 1830.

† Quamvis igitur Christus, ut homo, mortem obierit, sanctaque ipsius anima ab immaculato corpore distracta sit: divinitas tamen a neutro, hoc est nec ab anima, nec a corpore, quoque modo sejuncta est: neque propterea persona una in duas personas divisa est. Si quidem et corpus, et anima, ab initio in verbi persona eodem momento extiterunt: ac licet in morte divulsa fuerint, utrumque tamen eorum unam verbi hypostasim perpetuo habuit. Quamobrem una eademque verbi hypostasis tum verbi, tum animæ,

“What God has joined,” says Fulgentius, “let not man put asunder. Wherefore,” he says, “not that the body of Jesus, but that *Jesus* was laid in the sepulchre; for he knew that the God, who assumed the whole man, was wholly with his flesh in the sepulchre, wholly with his soul in hell, &c\*.”

This, however, was a refinement of later ages, for originally it was supposed that the logos, as well as the soul, quitted the body at its death. This is expressly said by Eusebius†.

mæ, tum corporis hypostasis erat. Neque enim unquam, aut anima, aut corpus, peculiarem atque a verbi hypostasi diversam hypostasim habuit: verum una semper fuit verbi hypostasis, ac nunquam duæ. Ac proinde una quoque semper Christi hypostasis fuit. Orthod. Fid. lib. 3. cap. 27. Opera, p. 430.

\* Et quia quod Deus conjunxit, homo non separat, propterea non corpus Jesu, sed Jesum dicit in monumento positum: sciebat enim quod ille susceptor pleni hominis Deus, totus esset cum carne sua in sepulchro, totus cum anima sua in inferno, totus in mundo, totus in cœlo, totus in unitate naturæ in patre, de quo exivit, totus per omnipotentiam divinitatis suæ in tota creatura quam fecit. Ad Græsimundum, lib. 3. cap. 25. p. 474.

† Ο των ολων ζωοποιος θεος λογος—το μεν σωμα προς βραχον καλιστα. De Laudibus Const. sect. 15. p. 764.

As the soul and the body of Christ retained their separate properties, the divine logos was also supposed to retain all its peculiar and extraordinary powers, and its former functions, so as to lose nothing of its omnipresence, and its active power in supporting the world. “Let us not,” says Origen, “say in our hearts that Christ is “contained in any place, and is not every “where, and diffused through all things; “for when he was on earth he said that he “was in heaven\*.” “At the very time,” says Eusebius, “that Christ was conversing “on earth, he filled all things, and was “with the Father, and administered the “affairs of the universe, things in heaven “and things on earth†.” “He is a crying “infant,” says Hilary, “and yet in hea-

\* Ne scilicet dicamus in corde nostro et putemus quod Christus in aliquo continetur, et non ubique est, ac per omnia ipse diffunditur; quippe qui cum esset in terris dicebat quia esset et in cœlo. In Rom. Opera, vol. 2. p. 585.

† Ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ ἐν τῷ τῷ καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐπολιτεύετο, καὶ πάντα ἐπλήρει, καὶ τῷ πατρὶ συνῆν· καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ γε γινώσκοντες, καὶ τῶν πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐν τῷ τῷ, τῶν τε καὶ ἔρασαν καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἐπεμελέετο. De Laudibus Const. p. 761.

“ven;

“ven; he increafes in wifdom, and is the  
“God of fulnefs\*.”

“He was not,” fays Athanafius, “circumfcribed by the body, nor was he fo  
“in the body, as not to be every where.  
“Nor did he fo a&tuare the body, as that  
“other things were deprived of his providential care. But what is wonderful,  
“being the logos, he was not contained by  
“any thing, but rather himfelf contained  
“every thing †.”

Fulgentius represents Chrift as “wholly  
“in the Father, as well as wholly out of  
“him. He was wholly,” he fays, “in the  
“virgin’s womb when he was building  
“himfelf a houfe, as we read, Prov. 8.  
“He was wholly in heaven, wholly in the  
“world, and wholly even in hell ‡.”

\* Vagit infans, fed in cœlo eſt; puer crefcit, fed plenitudinis Deus permanet. De Trinitate, lib. 10. p. 260.

† Ου γαρ περιμεκλειſμενος ην εν τω ſωματι, εδε εν ſωματι μεν ην, αλλαχρε δε εκ ην, εδε εκεινο μεν εκινει \* αλλα δε της αυτης προνοιας ες τρειſιο \* αλλα το παραδοξολογον, λογος ων, ε ſυνειχεſιο μεν υπο τινος, ſυνειχε δε τα παντα μαλλον αυτος. De Incarnatione, Opera, vol. 1. p. 69.

‡ Neque enim pars ejus remanſit in patre, et pars ejus deſcendit in virginem, cum totus in patre maneret quod erat, et totus in virgine fieret, quod non erat; totus cum

Here I would observe, that the opinion of Christ retaining all his divine powers while he was on earth, held by Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, and all the ancients, is a proof, that, in their opinion, the *logos* was no created spirit, or any principle that could be confined in its operations, by any circumstances in which it could be placed. Otherwise, as they found that, when Christ was upon earth, he applied to his Father upon all occasions, they would have more naturally thought that his own proper powers were suspended; and that the function which he had before discharged was for a time discontinued, or transferred to some other, which seems to be the opinion of all the modern Arians, and certainly best agrees with their principles. For what occasion had Christ to apply to his Father, to enable him to do nothing more than his own natural powers could

patre totum implens et continens mundum, totus sibi in utero virginis ædificans domum; scriptum est enim, sapientia ædificavit sibi domum; totus in patre sempiterno, totus in homine suscepto, totus in cœlo, totus in mundo, totus etiam in inferno. *Ad Trasimundum*, lib. 3. cap. 8, p. 468.

have



have performed, if those powers had been at liberty, and if he had continued to have the full use of them. We never think of praying to God for power to move our hands or feet, whenever we have occasion to make use of them, though we daily thank God for having given us that power. We know, and feel, that it is a power at the command of our own will, and therefore we look no farther than to ourselves for the immediate exercise of it. The same would necessarily have been the case with Christ, if he had cured diseases, and raised the dead, by a power as properly his own, and as much at his command, as that by which we move our limbs. His praying to the Father, therefore, and the miracles that he wrought being ascribed to the Father, who only, as he said, did these works, is a proof that, while he was on earth, he had not the power of doing them himself. Yet, contrary to the plainest evidence, all the ancient Fathers supposed that Christ then had that power, and they made his exertion of it a proof of his divinity.

## SECTION II.

*Of the Ignorance of Christ concerning the Day of Judgment.*

A Peculiarly difficult question occurs with respect to the union of the divine nature of Christ to his human soul; for as both were capable of knowledge, it might be supposed that, whatever was known to the one, must also have been known to the other, if there was any proper *union* between them. This consequence was so natural, that it would, I doubt not, have been maintained, if it had not been said, (Luke ii. 52.) that Jesus *increased in wisdom*, and our Lord had not so expressly said, that he did not know the time of the day of judgment.

With respect to the former, it seems to have been allowed, that the human soul of Christ acquired knowledge gradually, as other human souls do. But sometimes the Fathers show a confusion of ideas on the subject. Origen, who believed the pre-existence

pre-existence of all souls, but that they had lost all their attainments in their prior state, seems to have thought the same of the soul of Christ. “Jesus,” he says, “not yet a man, because he had emptied himself, advanced [in wisdom]. For no one who is perfect can make advances, but we who stand in need of improvement\*.” In this Origen could not mean the *logos*, because he supposed that to be omniscient, and even omnipresent, while it was connected with Christ on earth.

Afterwards, it was generally thought that even the soul of Christ knew every thing, in consequence of its union to the *logos*, and that Christ’s knowledge showing itself more and more was all that was meant by his increasing in wisdom. This is expressed by Nicephorus †.

\* *Ἰησους ἔκ ἀνὴρ γενομένος, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ παῖδιόν ὢν, ἐπεὶ ἐκεῖνος ἐαυτὸν, προεκπόπεν. ὡς δὲ προκοπῇ τελειούμενος, ἀλλὰ προκοπῇ δοκῶν προκοπῆς.* In Jerom. Hom. 1. Comment. vol. 1. p. 57.

† *Ἰησους δὲ προεκπόπε σοφία καὶ χάριτι, τῷ κατὰ μικρὸν αὐτὰ παρὰ δεικνυσθαι, καὶ τῷ λαμβάνειν ἐπιδύσθαι.* Hist. lib. 1. cap. 14. vol. 1. p. 79.

As Christ expressly says, that he did not know the day of judgment, he certainly either was, or pretended to be, ignorant of something which, at least in his divine nature, he must have known. Here, then, is a question, worthy of an Apollo to answer; and it may be amusing to observe what different solutions have been given of this difficulty.

Irenæus evidently supposed, that the time of the day of judgment was altogether unknown to the Son, and he advises us to acquiesce in our ignorance of many things, after his example\*. “If any one,” says he, “asks the reason why the Father, who communicates every thing to the Son, is alone said to know the day and the

\* Irrationabilitur autem inflati, audaciter inenarrabilia dei mysteria scire vos dicitis: quandoquidem et dominus, ipse filius Dei, ipsum judicii diem et horam concessit scire solum patrem, manifeste dicens: de die autem illa, et hora nemo scit neque filius, nisi pater solus. Si igitur scientiam diei illius filius non erubuit referre ad patrem, sed dixit quod verum est; neque nos erubescimus, quæ sunt in quæstionibus majora secundum nos, reservare Deo. Lib. 1. cap. 48. p. 176.

“ hour of the future judgment, no better  
“ reason can be given but that we may  
“ learn of our Lord himself, that the Fa-  
“ ther is above all ; for he said, the Fa-  
“ ther is greater than I \*.”

This being the earliest account that we have of any interpretation of this text, is a most unfavourable circumstance to the orthodox. It looks as if, at that time, whatever might be pretended concerning the super-human nature of Christ, the general opinion was, that he was wholly ignorant of the time of the future judgment. The fact must have been, that the doctrine of the divine logos in Christ was not received by the generality of christians, and though adopted by the philosophers among them, had not been pursued to its proper consequences. Otherwise, it could not but have been applied to this case, as

\* Et enim si quis exquirat causam, propter quam in omnibus pater communicans filio, solus scire horam et diem a domino manifestatus est ; neque aptabilem magis, neque decentiorem, nec sine periculo alteram quam hanc inveniat in præsenti (quoniam enim solus verax magister est dominus) ut discamus per ipsum, super omnia esse patrem. Et enim pater, ait, major me est. Lib. 2. cap. 49. p. 178.

well

well as to many others, which in due time it was.

The next interpretation of this passage that I have met with is that of Origen; and he did not hesitate to pronounce that Christ certainly did know what he professed not to know. “Christ,” says he, “being  
“the truth, cannot be ignorant of any  
“thing that is true\*.” “Have ye under-  
“stood all these things? He did not ask  
“this question because he was ignorant,  
“but having assumed human nature, he  
“did every thing that belongs to man, one  
“of which is to ask questions†.” This implies that even the human soul of Christ was acquainted with every thing, but that he feigned ignorance; and this we find to have been a pretty common interpretation. According to Hilary, “Christ knew the  
“time of the future judgment, but pre-  
“tended ignorance, because it was not time

\* *Επιστάειν αὐτὸν ἐκ τῆ ἀληθείας εἶναι τὸν σωτήρα, καὶ προσκαίρειν αὐτὸν εἰς ὁλοκλήρος εἶναι τὴν ἀληθείαν ὅθεν ἀληθὲς ἀγνοεῖ.* Comment. vol. 2. p. 28.

† Non ignarus interrogat, sed quoniam semel assumpserat hominem, utitur omnibus quæ sunt hominis. Quorum unum illud est interrogare. Opera, vol. 2. p. 11.

“to discover it\*.” In another place, he says, “the Son is said not to know the day of judgment, because he does not speak of it, and that the Father only knows it, because he only speaks of it to him†.”

Didymus of Alexandria says that “ignorance of the day of judgment is ascribed to Christ, as forgetfulness, repentance, &c. are ascribed to God, viz. for the sake of the hearers‡.” “If God,” says Cyril of Alexandria, “affected ignorance of where Adam was, and of what Cain had

\* In omnibus enim quæ ignorare se Deus loquitur, ignorantiam quidem profitetur, sed ignoratione tamen non detinetur; dum id quod nescit, non nesciendi infirmitas est, sed aut tempus est non loquendi, aut dispensatio est non agendi. Lib. 9. p. 226.

† Filius itaque diem idcirco quia tacet nescit, et patrem solum idcirco scire ait, quia solus uni sibi non tacet. Lib. 9. p. 231.

‡ Sicut enim cum Deus solus sit sapiens et scientiam habeat omnium, oblivio passibilis et penitentia aut aliquid hujusmodi in eo nequaquam existit, cum utique de eo dispensa vitæ dicantur. Ita ergo sapientia et veritate Dei ignorantiam non recipiente, propter quandam utilitatem horum, et diem judicii dicitur ignorare, quorum singula aperte monstrabuntur, cum de his fuerit dicendi propositum; In Joan. cap. 2. Bib. Pat. vol. 6. p. 653.

“done,

“ done, why should we wonder that the  
 “ Son of God affected ignorance concern-  
 “ ing the day of judgment;” adding, that  
 “ Christ also affected ignorance, when he  
 “ asked how many loaves his disciples  
 “ had \*.” Theophylact says, that “ Christ  
 “ pretended not to know the day of judg-  
 “ ment, to put an end to his disciples  
 “ teasing him; as fathers, when they see  
 “ their children crying for a thing which  
 “ they do not chuse to give them, will hide  
 “ it, and then show their hands empty, as  
 “ if they had it not †.”

\* Sed respondeant quæso, quando Deus in Paradiso Adam patrem nostrum vocabat dicens : Adam Adam ubi es? et quando Cain interrogabat : Ubi est Abel frater tuus? quid dicent? nam si ignorantem Deum interrogasse affirmabunt, manifesta impietate tenebuntur; sin autem dispensationis modo quodam sic interrogasse Deum dicent, cur mirantur si filius quoque Dei, per quem etiam tunc facta interrogatio est, utiliter dispensans ignorare se dicit horam illam ut homo, quamvis universa sciat ut sapientia patris? quod autem dispensative solebat ignorantiam sibi attribuere salvator, manifeste ab ipso evangelista in alio loco dicitur. Nam quando miraculose multiplicatis panibus sequentes se voluit alere, ut ignorans interrogabat : quot panes habetis? Thesaurus, lib. 9. cap. 4. Opera, vol 2. p. 29.

† Νυν δε, σοφωτερον μεταχειριζεσθαι. απειργει αυτες ολως τα ζηλειν μαθειν κ' ενοχλειν αυτω, εν τω ειπειν οτι ελε οι αγγελου, ελε εγω οίδα.



We have two answers of Epiphanius to this question, one of which seems to imply that Christ feigned ignorance. “If,” says he, “the Son knew the Father, which “is the greatest of all, he must know the “day of judgment. But it became a Son “to honour his Father, that he might “show that he was his own Son\*.” The other solution implies a base equivocation on the part of our Saviour. “Christ,” says he, “did not know the day of judgment; “meaning that it had not taken place, “the wicked not being punished†.”

We have also two answers of Basil to this question, one of which likewise implies a

απο δε παιραιδειγματος τινος, νουσεις το λεγομενον. πολλανις παιδια μικρα βλεπεις τις πατερης αυτων κρατειναις τι εν ταις χειρσι, κη ζηησαι τελω. οι δε πατερες, ε βεβλονται δειναι. τα δε, κλαυθυμιζονται ως μη λαμβανονται. τελειων μενοι, οι πατερες κρυπτεσιν εκεινο ο κρατεισι, κη επιδεικνυντες ταις χειρας κεναις τοις παιδιοις, ισωσιν αυτα τε κλαυθυμω.

In Marc. 13. Opera, vol. 1. p. 267.

\* Πως εν ο τα μειζω ειδως των ελαττων υφειρει \* ει γνωσκει τοινον τον πατερα, γνωσκει. παντως κη την ημεραν. κη υδεν εστιν ε λειπειται καλα γνωσιν ο υιος. Εδει γαρ αληθως τον γνησιον υιον τιμω τον ιδιον πατερα, ινα δειξη την γνησιότητα. Ancoratus, sect. 17. Opera, vol. 2. p. 23.

† Ουτω δε εγω αυτην καλα πραξιν, τελωσιν επω εφηνεν. ει γαρ ασεβεις ασεβουσι, &c. Hær. 69. p. 769.

feigned ignorance. “Christ,” says he, “concealed the day of judgment, because it was not convenient for men to be informed of it\*.” But the other solution implies something else. “The Father knows the day of judgment in the first instance, being the cause of all knowledge†.” Ambrose again has recourse to a feigned ignorance. “Christ, out of the great love that he bore to his disciples, thinking it useless to them to know what they enquired about, chose rather to seem to be ignorant than to deny them‡.”

The answer of Austin is peculiar, implying, that our Saviour had recourse to an Hebrew idiom, in which the verb *to know*, may signify *to make others know*, as if he

\* Δια το μη συμφεerein εν τοις ανθρωποις αποκται τον καιρον της κρισεως απεσιωπησεν. Ad Eunomium, Hom. 4. p. 770.

† Ουτω η το εδεις οιδε, την πρωτην ειδησιν των τε οντων η των εσμενων επι τον πατερα αναγοντος, η δια παυλων την πρωτην αληθειαν τοις ανθρωποις υποδεικνυντος ειρησθαι νομιζομεν. Epist. 391. Opera, vol. 3. p. 389.

‡ Multum enim dominus nimio in discipulos amore propensus, potentibus his quæ cognitu inutilia judicaret, videri ignorare quod noverat quam negare. De Fide, lib. 5. cap. 7. Opera, vol. 4. p. 205.

had said, I do know myself, but I shall not tell you of it. “Christ,” says he, “did not know the day of judgment, that is, he did not *make to know*, or discover it to others\*.”

Photius seems to have considered ignorance as a property of human nature, and therefore to have thought that our Lord took it upon him of course when he became a man. “As a man,” says he, “Christ did not reject that ignorance which became him as a man. He who took the whole, would he refuse to take any part, or not shew that he had taken it†?” This looks as if there was no communication between the divinity and the human soul of Christ; and on this supposition the orthodox of the present age endeavour to satisfy themselves and others; saying, that Christ knew all things as God, but was ignorant of many

\* Hoc enim nescit, quod nescientes facit, id est, quod non ita sciebat, ut tunc discipulis indicaret. De Trinitate, lib. 1. cap. 12. Opera, vol. 3. p. 253.

† Ως ανθρωπος δε, εδε την ανθρωποις παρεχουσαν αγνοιαν, ε μεν εν εκ ηθει . Ος γαρ δη το ολον ειλεο λαβειν, πως εν τι των περι εκεινο παρηλησαιο μη λαβειν, η μη πεισθαι οτι παρεχοι λαβων. Epist. 228. p. 336.

things as man; and this was perhaps the meaning of Athanasius (if the *Fragments on the Psalms* be his) who said, “ what he “ knows by nature as God, he is said to “ hear according to his human nature, and “ the œconomy\*.”

Damascenus thought that the human soul of Christ, in consequence of the union and personal identity between the two natures, knew every thing, even future events†.”

Gregory the Great has a very peculiar solution of this difficulty. He says that “ Christ was ignorant of the day of judgment “ with respect to his body the church‡”

The most prudent of all the answers, is that of Leontius, who says, “ the question

\* Οὕτω γὰρ ἀπερ οἶδε φυσικῶς ὡς θεός, ταῦτα παλιν ἀκκεῖν λέγεται διὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον οἰκονομικῶς. Opera, vol. 2. p. 522.

† At domini anima, ob unionem cum ipso Deo verbo, ac personalem identitatem, ut reliquorum miraculorum, sic etiam futurarum, ut dixi, rerum notitiam consecuta est. Orthod. Fid. lib. 3. cap. 21. p. 421.

‡ Quia diem et horam neque filius neque angeli sciunt: omnino recte vestra sanctitas sensit, quoniam non ad eundem filium, juxta hoc quod caput est, sed juxta corpus ejus nos quod sumus, est certissime referendum. Epist. cap. 42. Opera, vol. 2. p. 223. A.

“concerning Christ’s ignorance, is not to  
“be anxiously enquired into\*.”

It is Mark who asserts in the strongest manner that Christ was ignorant of the day of judgment; for he expressly says, chap. xiii. 32. *neither the Son, but the Father*. But Ambrose says, that the ancient Greeks had not the words *neither the Son* in that passage †.”

There was at Constantinople, a particular sect of those who maintained that, as a man, Christ did not know the day of judgment. They were therefore called *Agnoetæ*. But the orthodox opinion then was, that he knew it as a man, and Theodosius wrote against them ‡.

\* Nos autem dicimus non adeo de his subtiliter inquirendum. Leont. De Sectis, Bib. Pat. App. p. 1875.

† Scriptum est inquiunt, de die autem illo et hora nemo scit, neque angeli cælorum, nec filius, nisi solus pater. Primum non habent codices Græci, quod nec filius scit. Sed et non mirum si et hoc falsarunt, qui scripturas interpolavere divinas. De Fide, lib 5. cap.7. Op. vol. 4. p. 202.

‡ Quum autem privatus Byzantii Theodosius degeret Agnoetarum (sic ab ignoratione dictorum) dogma motum fuit. Nam quia dominus ait, neminem horam judicii scire,

## SECTION III.

*Opinions concerning the body of Christ.*

I HAVE had occasion to observe more than once, that christianity was never quite purged from the errors of the Gnostics. For though the orthodox, who opposed them, advanced different principles, they were insensibly led to several of the same conclusions. Thus the orthodox agreed with the Gnostics in supposing, that the maker of the world was different from the Supreme God, and they came to agree with them at last, in supposing matter to be the cause of all evil. At least they adopted the same maxims and practices with respect to corporeal austerities; and several of them, we shall now find, came very near to them with respect to their doctrine concerning

ne filium quidem, extra solum patrem: quæsitum est, an Christus eam ignoraret, ut homo. Theodosius Christum ignorare negabat, et adversus Agnoetas scripsit. Leontius De Sectis Bib. Pat. App. p. 1861.

the

the person of *Christ*. All the Gnostics thought that the proper *Christ* was a super-angelic being, which had existed long before the birth of *Jesus*; and in this also the orthodox agreed with them, only supposing that this divine inhabitant of *Jesus*, was of a higher rank than the Gnostics had made him to be (which was really departing farther from the genuine simplicity of the gospel) and they applied the term *Christ*, not to the divine inhabitant of *Jesus* only, but to his whole compound person, which was a difference merely verbal.

Lastly, some of the Gnostics thought that *Christ* had no real body, and consequently, had not the sensations or feelings of one; but the orthodox principle of the union of the divine nature to the human produced almost the same effect. For some of the catholics supposed, that, in consequence of this union, the body of *Christ* was exempt from all disagreeable sensations; and indeed this was a natural consequence of their principles. For if there was a real union between the two natures, the sensations of the one must have been communicated to

the other; and as it was agreed that the divine nature could not feel pain, the human nature, in order to enjoy the benefit of the union, ought to be exempt from pain also, which we shall find was actually held by Hilary.

In general, however, it was maintained that the human nature of Christ was as effectually deserted by the divine nature in the day of suffering, as the Gnostics had ever supposed it to be; and it is very remarkable, how nearly the language of the orthodox on this subject approached to that of the Gnostics. Tertullian, in a passage quoted before says, that “the complaint uttered by Christ on the cross, was from the man, not from the God, to shew that God was impassible, who thus left the Son, and gave up the man to death\*.” “Let him learn,” says Origen, “that the logos, always remaining the logos, feels nothing of the suffering of the body, or

\* *Hæc vox carnis et animæ, id est hominis, non sermonis, nec spiritus, id est non Dei, propterea emissæ est, ut impassibilem Deum ostenderet, qui sic filium dereliquit, dum hominem ejus tradidit in mortem. Ad Praxeam, sect. 30. p. 518.*



“ the soul \*.” “ As the sun-beams,” says Damascenus, “ are not hurt when a tree on which it shines is cut down ; so neither was the divinity of Christ affected when his flesh suffered †.” The opinion contrary to this, ascribed to the Patripassians, was deemed a heresy. Thus, Austin says, “ there is another heresy, which says that the divinity in Christ grieved, when his flesh was fixed to the cross ‡.”

It being, therefore, a settled point, that the divine nature of Christ could not feel pain ; it is no wonder that some of the orthodox should have agreed with those Gnostics who held that his body, or what had the appearance of a body, had not the wants

\* Μανθανειν οτι ο λογος τη βρια μενων λογος, εδεν μεν πασχει ων πασχει το σωμα η η ψυχη. Ad Celsum, lib. 3. p. 170.

† Quemadmodum enim si sole arbori illucente securis arborem inciderit, sol tamen insecutus, atque ab omni injuria incolumis manet : eodem modo, ac multo etiam magis, impassibilis verbi divinitas, carni personaliter unita, patiente carne incolumis mansit. *Orthod. Fid. lib. 3. cap. 26. Opera, p. 428.*

‡ Alia est hæresis, quæ dicit in Christo divinitatem doluisse, cum figeretur caro ejus in cruce. *Catalogus Her. Opera, vol. 6. p. 29.*

and weakneſſes of other bodies, and was likewiſe inſenſible of pain.

Clemens Alexandrinus ſays, “ It would  
 “ be ridiculous to ſuppoſe that the body of  
 “ our Lord required ſupplies for its ſup-  
 “ port. He ate not on account of his body,  
 “ which was ſupported by divine power,  
 “ but leſt thoſe who converſed with him  
 “ ſhould have had a ſuſpicion that he was a  
 “ phantaſm, and had only the appearance of  
 “ a man.” He alſo ſays that “ he was ex-  
 “ empt from all paſſion, pleaſurable or pain-  
 “ ful \*.”

Hilary maintained that the body of Chriſt was impaſſible. “ You will not be-  
 “ lieve,” ſays he, “ impious heretic, but  
 “ that Chriſt felt when the nails pierced  
 “ his hands.—I aſk, why did not the chil-  
 “ dren,” meaning the three in Daniel, “ fear

\* *Επι μὲν τῆ σωτήρος το σώμα ἀπαίειν ὡς σώμα τὰς ἀναγκαιὰς  
 ὑπηρεσίας εἰς διακονίαν, γελῶς οὐκ εἶη· ἐφαγὲν γὰρ ἔτι διὰ το σώμα,  
 δύναμει συνεχομένον ἁγία· ἀλλὰ ὡς μὴ τῆς συνουσίας ἀλλῶς περὶ αὐτῆς  
 φρονεῖν ὑπεισέλθῃ· ὥσπερ ἀμελεῖ ὑπερὸν, δοκῇτι τινὲς αὐτὸν πεφά-  
 νεραισθῆναι ὑπελάβον· αὐτὸς δὲ ἀπαξαιπλῶς ἀπαθῆς ἦν, εἰς οὐ οὐδὲν  
 παρεισδύειναι κίνημα παθητικόν, εἴτε ἡδονή, εἴτε λυπή. Strom. 6. p.  
 649.*

“ the fire, or feel pain\*.” Other respectable writers maintained that the body of Christ was free from the affections of other human bodies. Ambrose says “ It was artifice in “ Christ to pretend to be hungry †.” “ In “ the divine and holy body of Christ,” says Cyril of Alexandria, “ there are no passions; “ and being the property of the logos, in- “ habiting it, and united to it, it is per- “ fectly sanctified ‡.” “ Christ,” says Cas- sian, “ did not feel carnal desire§.”

Anastafius Sanaita makes a difference between common flesh and the flesh of Christ,

\* Non vis impie hæretice, ut transeunte palmas clavo Christus non doluerit, neque vulnus illud nullam acerbita- tem teli compungentis intulerit. Interrogo cur pueri ignes non timuerint, nec doluerint. De Trinitate, lib. 10. p. 255.

† Videte artem domini qua adversarium fraude circum- venit. Post multa jejunia esurire se simulat, ut diabolum, quem jejunando jam vicerat, iterum esuriendo sollicitet. Ser. 37. Opera, vol. 5. p. 53.

‡ Αλλ' οτι εν τε τω θεω και αγιω τε χριστε σωματι τοις διον τι κενω- σθαι φαμεν, αλλ' ην απονια φρενα και εκποσιδια των παθων, και ως ιδιον γεγονος τε ενωθεν αυτω εν οικειος λογος κατεπληθει του αγιασμου. Contra Julianum, lib. 8. Juliani Opera, vol. 2. p. 287.

§ Non enim ignitos aculeos concupiscentiæ carnalis ex- pertus est. Coll. 5. Opera, p. 392.

and says that, on this account, Gregory Nazianzen scrupled not to say that the flesh of Christ was God-like\*.

Notwithstanding it was so much a settled point with the ancient Fathers, that the divine nature could not suffer or feel pain; yet during the Nestorian controversy, it was customary for the orthodox to hold a different language, and to say that the logos itself was crucified, suffered, and even died. This was in answer to Nestorius, who maintained that there were two distinct natures in Christ, the divine and the human, and that it could only be the human nature in Christ that suffered. The language which the orthodox made use of in answer to him was very extraordinary, and often shocking. Cassian says in so many words, that “God was crucified†.” “If any “one,” says Cyril of Alexandria, “does

\* *Est enim caro et non caro—Et ideo Gregorius in theologia celeberrimus non veretur dicere carnem domini quodam, id est, simul Deum.* In Hexameron. Bib. Pat. App. p. 1407.

† *Ergo necesse est ut Christum affixum esse in cruce deneges; aut Deum affixum esse fatearis.* De Incarnatione, lib. 3. cap. 10. p. 995.

“ not confess that the word of God suffered  
 “ in the flesh, was crucified in the flesh,  
 “ and tasted death in the flesh, being made  
 “ the first-born from the dead, as he is the  
 “ life, and the giver of life, as God, let  
 “ him be anathema \*.”

But when this writer comes to explain himself, it appears that what he said was nothing better than a quibble. “ God the  
 “ word,” he says, “ was free from passion ;  
 “ but he appropriated to himself what was  
 “ done to his own body †.” “ Christ is  
 “ palpable and impalpable, visible and in-  
 “ visible ‡. We ascribe to him human  
 “ properties on account of the dispensation  
 “ of the flesh, and divine ones on account  
 “ of his ineffable generation from the Fa-

\* Si quis non confitetur verbum Dei carne esse passum, carne crucifixum, et mortem carne gustasse, primo genitum ex mortuis factum, quemadmodum et vita est, et vivificans, sicut Deus, Anathema esto. Epist. Opera, vol. 2. p. 27.

† Tum cogita quod Deus verbum passionis quidem manserit expers, verum hæc omnia proprio corpori facta sibi appropriarit. Hom. Opera, vol. 2. p. 75.

‡ Dicimus itaque eundem palpabilem cum sit impalpabilis, visibilem cum sit invisibilis. Ibid. p. 96.

“ ther.”

“ther\*.” He also says expressly, “We  
 “all acknowledge that the word of God is  
 “impaffible†.” Theodoret likewise says  
 “because the body which was assumed is  
 “called the body of the only begotten Son  
 “of God, the sufferings of that body are  
 “referred to him‡.”

The doctrine of the union between the  
 divine and human nature of Christ seems to  
 have been carried to its greatest height by  
 Damascenus, who says, “the flesh of Christ,  
 “on account of its union with the logos,  
 “has a life-giving property, is endued  
 “with a knowledge of futurity, and may  
 “even be said always to have been§.” For

\* Et huic adscribimus tam humana, propter dispensationem illius cum carne susceptam, quam divina propter inenarrabilem illius quam ex patre habet generationem. Hom. Opera, vol. 2. p. 97.

† Præterea et impaffibile esse verbum Dei confitemur omnes. Epist. 28. Opera, vol. 2. p. 41.

‡ Καὶ ἐπειδὴ παρ' αὐτῆς μοιγενὲς υἱὸς τῷ θεῷ σῶμα το ληφθέν προσηγορευθῆναι σῶμα, εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναφέρει το τε σωματικὸς πάθος. Epist. 141. Opera, vol. 3. p. 1019.

§ Serva et ignorans Christi caro dicitur. Verum ob personæ identitatem, atque indivulsam conjunctionem, domini anima rerum futurarum cognitione, quemadmodum

this he quotes Gregory Nazianzen. “The  
“orthodox believe the deification of the  
“flesh of Christ, though without any change  
“of its properties. The one brought, and  
“the other received divinity\*.”

The nature of the body of Christ was one part of the Apollinarian controversy. Apollinarius held an opinion on this subject, which very much resembles that of some of the Gnostics. For he said that “it came  
“from heaven †,” “that it was eter-  
“nal ‡,” and that “it was consubstantial  
“with the divinity §.” Some who were  
dum et reliquis miraculis, locupletata est. *Orthod. Fid. lib.*  
3. cap. 21. *Opera*, p. 421.

\* Ut enim incarnationem citra mutationem et conversionem confitemur : sic item carni deificationem factam esse censemus. Sic enim Theologus Gregorius loquitur : Quorum alterum divinitatem attulit, alterum divinitatem accepit. *Ibid.* cap. 17. p. 413.

† Τινες μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸν εἰσολμησαν λέγειν, ἀνῶθεν τὸν χριστὸν τὸ σῶμα κατέληννοχεναι. *Epiphanius*, H. 77. p. 996.

‡ Ὡς εἰπεῖν μὴ νεώτερον εἶναι τὸ σῶμα τῆς τε λόγῃ θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ συγκατὰ αὐτῷ διαπαντὸς γεγενῆσθαι, ἐπεὶ ἐκ τῆς σοφίας συνεστῆ. *Ibid.* p. 999.

Εξ ἀρχῆς ἐν τῷ υἱῷ τὴν σαρκωδὴ ἐκείνην φύσιν εἶναι. *G. Nazianzen*, Or. 46. *Opera*, p. 722.

§ Τινες δὲ καὶ ὁμοῖον τὸ σῶμα τῷ χριστῷ τῇ θεοῦ λέγειν εἰσολμησαν. *Epiphanius*. H. 77. *Opera*, vol. 1. p. 997.

called

called *Gainites*, also held that “the body of  
“ Christ was incorruptible\*.”

That the body of Christ was naturally incorruptible was an opinion very prevalent among the orthodox after the council of Nice. Athanasius says, that “the body of  
“ Christ suffered according to the nature of  
“ bodies, but that it had the property of  
“ incorruptibility from the *logos* inhabit-  
“ ing it†.” Fulgentius says, that “the body  
“ of Christ had no corruption in the grave,  
“ and his soul no pain in hell.” This he ascribes to the body and soul being free from sin‡. The emperor Justinian adopted this opinion some time before his death. But it was afterwards generally condemned.

\* *Constitutur Gainite Deum sermonem e virgine naturam humanam adsumpsisse perfectæ ac vere, sed post unionem esse corpus incorruptibile dicunt.* Leontius de Sectis, Bib. Pat. App. p. 1873.

† *Πασχεν μὲν γὰρ τὸ σῶμα κατὰ τὴν τῶν σαρμάτων φύσιν ἐπάσχειν· εἶχε δὲ τῆς ἀθάνατος τὴν φύσιν ἐν τῇ συζυγησάντῃ αὐτῷ λόγῳ.* *Sermo Major de fide in Montfaucon, vol. 2. p. 7.*

‡ Sic tamen, ut nec Christi caro in sepulchro corrumpetur, nec inferni doloribus anima torqueretur. Quoniam anima, immunis a peccato non erat subdenda supplicio, et carnem sine peccato non debuit vitare corruptio. *Ad Trasimundum, lib. 3. cap. 30. p. 476.*

Agebard





## C H A P T E R VIII.

*Of the Use of the Incarnation, and the Objections that were made to the Doctrine.*

**I**T is not my design in this work to treat largely concerning the *use* of the doctrine of the incarnation, as I have already done it in what I have advanced concerning the doctrine of *atonement*, in my *History of the Corruptions of Christianity*. But having selected a few passages which may throw some farther light on the subject, from the works which have lately gone through my hands, it may not be amiss to insert them in this place.

The great and immediate object of the doctrine of the incarnation of the *logos* was the exaltation of the person of Christ; but it was soon found to answer another purpose, and this was to enable the philosophizing christians to conceive how *man* should conquer *death*, and the *devil*, which they say he could not have done, without

4 the

the assistance of *divinity*. For this purpose they supposed that the divine nature of Christ was so *mixed* with the human, that the actions of the one were attributed to the other; and they also conceived the human nature of Christ to be, as it were, the representative of mankind in general. They were likewise struck with the idea of the same being that made the world coming to restore it. “There is nothing absurd,” says Athanasius, “in supposing that the Father saved the world by the same person by whom he made it\*.” “It was necessary,” says Job, the monk, “that the maker of the world should reform and renew his own workmanship, which had received injury†.”

Equal stress was laid both upon the *divinity* and the *humanity* of Christ, in order to accomplish this end. “God,” says Irenæus, “shall judge the Ebionites; for

\* Ουδεν γαρ εναντιον φανησεται, ει δι ε ταυτην εδημιουργησεν ο πατηρ, εν αυτω κη την ταυτης σωτηριαν εργασασθαι. De Incarnatione Opera, vol. i. p. 54.

† Ως εχρην τον δημιουργον κη πλαστην, αυτον κη αναπλασαι κη ανακαινισαι συνλριθεν το δημιουργημα. Phot. Bib. fecit. 222, p. 582.

“ how can they be saved, unless it be God  
 “ who works out their salvation upon  
 “ earth; and how can man go to God, if  
 “ God do not come to man \*?” But it was  
 equally necessary that Christ should have  
 a proper human nature, that it might be  
 a man who conquered his own enemies.  
 “ Man,” says Athanasius, “ was corrupted  
 “ and destroyed; wherefore the logos made  
 “ use of man as an instrument, and con-  
 “ formed himself in all things †.” “ The  
 “ human nature of Christ,” says Gregory  
 Nyssen, “ by which the whole of human  
 “ nature was mixed with the Deity, is  
 “ taken out of all human nature, as the  
 “ first fruits of the common mass ‡.” Also  
 Gregory Nazianzen speaks of Christ as re-

\* Ανακρίνει δὲ καὶ τῆς Ἡεϊωνῆς πως δύναται σωθῆναι εἰ μὴ ὁ θεὸς ἦν  
 ὁ τὴν σωτηρίαν αὐτῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἐργασάμενος \* ἢ πως ἀνθρώπος χωρήσει  
 εἰς θεόν, εἰ μὴ ὁ θεὸς ἐχωρήθῃ εἰς ἀνθρώπον. Lib. 4. cap. 59.  
 p. 358.

† Ἀλλ’ ὁ ἤδη γενομένος ἀνθρώπος ἐφ’ ἑαυτὸν καὶ παρὰ πολλοῖς. ὁ δὲ  
 εἰκοτὼς ἀνθρώπινον κεχρητῆαι καλῶς ὀργανῶν, καὶ εἰς πάντα εαυτὸν ἠπλω-  
 σεν ὁ λόγος. De Incarnatione, Opera, vol. i. p. 98.

‡ Ἐκ πάσης δὲ τῆς ἀνθρώπινης φύσεως ἡ καλεμιχθὴ τῶν θεῶν, οἷον  
 ἀπαρχὴ τῆς τῆ κοινῆς φυραμαλῆς ὁ καὶ αὐτὸν ἀνθρώπος ὑπέστη, διὰ  
 προσέφυη τῇ θεότητι παντὶ ἀνθρώπινον. Opera, vol. i. p. 844.

“ presenting

“ presenting human nature, when he hung  
 “ upon the cross, and says, that in this capa-  
 “ city he said, *My God, my God, why hast thou*  
 “ *forsaken me* ; not meaning that he him-  
 “ self was deserted either by the Father, or  
 “ by his own divinity, but only that hu-  
 “ man nature was in a deserted and de-  
 “ spised state \*.”

Chrysostom, speaking of Christ bidding his disciples to handle and feel him, that they might be satisfied that he was no spirit, and of his reproof to Peter about his suffering death, says, that “ his human  
 “ nature was that on which our salvation  
 “ chiefly depended ; for thus death and sin  
 “ are destroyed, the curse abolished, and a  
 “ thousand blessings introduced. He there-  
 “ fore chose that his humanity should be  
 “ believed in the first place, this being the  
 “ root and foundation of innumerable good  
 “ things †.” He also says, that “ when

\* Ου γαρ αὐτῷ ἐγκαίαλεστέται ἡ ὑπο τῶ πατρὸς, ἡ ὑπο τῆς  
 αὐτοῦ θεότης.—Εν αὐτῷ δὲ ὡς περ εἶπον τυποῖ το ἡμεῖρον. ἡμεῖς  
 γὰρ ἡμεν οἱ ἐγκαίαλεστέμενοι καὶ παρρωραμένοι πρότερον, εἴτα νῦν παρ-  
 σειστέμενοι καὶ σεσωστέμενοι τοῖς τῶ ἀπαθὲς παθεσιν. Or. 36.  
 Opera, p. 581:

† Μαλλον δὲ τῆς ὑπερ ἡμῶν σωτηρίας το κεφαλαιον [τῆς] καὶ δι  
 τῶ πᾶσι γεγενῆσθαι καὶ καθορθῶσθαι. εἶτα γὰρ καὶ θάνατος ἐλυθῆ, καὶ ἀμαρτία

“ Christ was led by the spirit into the  
 “ wilderiness, and conquered the devil, it  
 “ was not his divinity that did it; for that  
 “ it would have been disgraceful to the  
 “ Deity to say, *I have conquered*\*.” He  
 also says, that “ Christ saves us, and makes  
 “ intercession, as a man †.”

Theodoret makes it the strongest objection to the doctrine of Eutyches, that, upon his scheme, “ we have no advantage from  
 “ the incarnation, nor any pledge of our  
 “ own resurrection. For it will not follow, that because God rose from the  
 “ grave, therefore man will, the difference of  
 “ the natures is so great ‡.” Arguing against

ανθρωπην, καὶ κατὰρα ἠφανίσθη, καὶ τὰ μυρία εἰσηλθεν εἰς τὴν βίον ἡμῶν ἀγαθὰ. διὸ μάλιστα ἐβέλετο πιστευσθαι τὴν οἰκονομίαν, τὴν ρίζαν καὶ πηγὴν ἡμῶν τῶν μυρίων γενομένην ἀγαθῶν. οἰκονομῶν δὲ τὰ θεῖα συσκηξέσθαι ὀφεί. In John. Hom. 30. Opera, vol. 8. p. 155.

\* Ἀνιχθῆν ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος πειρασθῆναι, καὶ ἐνίκησε τὸν διάβολον, οὐχ ἡ θεότης. Ὅτις γὰρ ἦν τῇ θεότητι το εἰπεῖν ἐνίκησα. De Sp. S. vol. 6. p. 216.

† Πῶς σώζει· Παύλῳ ζῶν, εἰς τὸ ἐνθυγχανεῖν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. ὁρᾷ ἀνθρωποποίη. In Heb. 7. Opera, vol. 10. p. 1846.

‡ ἵνα δὲ τὴν τῆς μακίας ὑπερβολὴν καταλιπώμεν. ἐκεῖνο σκοπήσωμεν, ὡς ἔδεν ἡμῖν ὁ φελοῦς ἐκ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως γεγενῆσθαι, καὶ τῆς ἡμέτερας ἀναστάσεως ἔδεν ἐγγενῶς εἶναι. ἔδεν γὰρ εἰ θεὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγγενῶς, πάντως καὶ ἀνθρώπος ἀναστήσεται. πάντες γὰρ τῶν φύσεων τὸ διάφορον. Hær. Fab. lib. 4. cap. 13. Opera, vol. 4. p. 373. Ed. Halæ.

the Apollinarians, he says, that “ if Christ  
 “ had a logos, instead of a human soul, it  
 “ was God and not man that overcame in  
 “ the temptation ; and, therefore, that man  
 “ could derive no benefit from it. The  
 “ devil,” he also says, “ would exult, as  
 “ having been overcome, not by man, but  
 “ by God. For it was a great thing to  
 “ him to be conquered by God \*.” A  
 more particular account of the use of the  
 incarnation, but all proceeding upon the  
 same idea, may be seen in Eusebius, *De*  
*Laudibus, Constantini*, cap. 14. p. 759. and  
 in Austin, *De Civitate Dei*, lib. 10. cap. 29.  
*Opera*, vol. 5. p. 590.

Origen’s idea on this subject was some-  
 what peculiar, but sufficiently agreeable to  
 his doctrine of the logos, as the universal  
 agent of the deity operating through all  
 nature. For, he says, “ Christ died not  
 “ for man only, but for all rational crea-  
 “ tures, even for the stars,” which, as a  
 Platonist, he supposed to be animated.—  
 For, says he, “ the stars are not clean  
 “ in his sight, as we read in the book

\* Εγω μὲν εἶδεναι ἀπονάμην της νικης, ως εἶδεν εἰς ταύτην εἰσενεγ-  
 κων· ἀλλὰ καὶ της ἐνέειπεν ευφροσύνης γεγενημένης ἐπὶ τροπαίοις γαι-  
 ρων ἀλλήλοις. *Opera*, vol. 5. p. 47.

“ of Job\*.” Still, however, he retained the idea of the *logos* serving men in the character of a man, and other beings in their peculiar characters. For, he says, “ Christ “ was a man for men, and an angel to “ angels,” as he infers from his appearances in the Old Testament†. It is evident, however, from this, that Origen did not consider *suffering* as necessary to redemption. For though, according to him, Christ assumed the form of an angel, he could not suppose that he suffered in that form.

Though the doctrine of the incarnation of the *logos* served to cover the reproach of the cross, and to make the religion of Christ appear more respectable, which no doubt it did with many, it did not answer this end universally. For the thing itself was so monstrous and absurd, that it was much ridiculed by those who did not embrace it. Of this we have many instances,

\* Ου μόνον υπέρ ανθρωπων απεθανεν, αλλά κ' υπέρ των λοιπων λογικων εἰς χάριν· δεῦρ ἐγευσάτο τὴν υπέρ πάντος θανάτου. — Οἷον υπέρ αἰσρων· ἔδε των αἰσρων πάντως καθάρων οὐλῶν ἐνωπίον τὴν δεῦρ, ὡς ἐν τῷ Ιωδ' ανεγνωμεν. Comment. vol. 2. p. 39.

† Καὶ σαφὲς γέγονεν ἀνθρωπίνης ἀνθρωπίνῃ, κ' ἀγγελοῖς ἀγγελῇ. Ibid. p. 32.



almost from the time that it was first started to a very late period.

In Justin's dialogue with Trypho, the latter says, "You tell me something incredible, and almost impossible, that God could be born and become a man \*."

Celsus objected to the "impossibility of God becoming man †." "God, O Jews, and Christians, or the Son of God, never descended, or could descend ‡." "The conceited Greeks," says Clemens Alexandrinus, "think it fabulous, that the Son of God should speak by man, that God should have a Son, and that he should suffer; and having this prejudice, they are prevented from believing §." "You say," says Lactantius, "it is impossible that any thing should be taken from an

\* Απιστον γαρ κ' αδυναλον σχεδον πραγμα επιχειρεις αποδεικνυναι, οτι δεθ' υπεμενε γεννηθηναι, κ' ανθρωποθ' γενεσθαι. p. 283.

† Οι ησοι ως αληθως μεταβαλλει ο δεθ', ωσπερ ειλο φασιν εις σωμα δηλον, κ' προειρηται το αδυναλον. Origen Contra Celsum, lib. 4. p. 171.

‡ Θεθ' μεν, ω Ιουδαιοι κ' χριστιανοι, κ' δεθ' πασις υδεις ειτε καληλθεν, ειτε καληλδοι. Ibid. lib. 5. p. 231.

§ Μυθωδες γαρ ηγαλται οι δοκητισοφοι, δια τε ανθρωπος υιον δεθ' λαλειν, υιον τε εχειν τον θεον, κ' δη κ' πεπονθεναι τειλον. οθεν αυτες η προληψις της οησεως αναπειθει απισειν. Strom. lib. 1. p. 313.

“ immortal being. You say it is unworthy  
 “ of God to become a man, and to load  
 “ himself with the infirmities of the flesh,  
 “ so as to subject himself to passions, pain,  
 “ and death \*.”

Athanasius strongly expresses this objection to the incarnation of the Son of God.  
 “ The Jews,” says he, “ reproach us for  
 “ it, the Gentiles laugh at it, but we  
 “ adore it †.” “ They urge us,” he says,  
 “ with heathenish and Jewish blasphemies,  
 “ laughing at the mystery of the mission  
 “ of the logos, and the incarnation ‡.”  
 “ Some, thinking with heathens and Jews,  
 “ not admitting that God was incarnate,  
 “ but endeavouring to comprehend by human reasoning and philosophy, things  
 “ that are incomprehensible, as how that

\* *Negant fieri potuisse, ut naturæ immortali quicquam decederet. Negant denique Deo dignum, ut homo fieri vellet, seque infirmitate carnis oneraret; ut passionibus, ut doleri, ut morti seipse subjicerit. Inslit. lib. 4. sect. 22. p. 424.*

† *Ἦν Ἰουδαῖοι μὲν διαβόλλουσιν, Ἕλληνες δὲ χλευαῖουσιν, ἡμεῖς δὲ προσκυνούμεν. De Incarnatione, Opera, vol. 1. p. 53.*

‡ *Ἄλλας τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἡμῶν ἀνιλογοίας κινεῖσι, καὶ τὰς ἐξ Ἰουδαίων βλασφημίας ἐπιφέρουσι, χλευαζόντες τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀποστολῆς τοῦ λόγου καὶ σαρκωστος. Contra Sabellium, Opera, vol. 1. p. 663.*

“ which

“ which is incorporeal can be born, how  
 “ it can proceed, and where can be that  
 “ which is every where, and contains all  
 “ things, and fills all things; from this  
 “ arguing about *how*, and *where*, they go  
 “ into infidelity \*.”

Libanius ridiculed the christians for making a man of Palestine a god, and the son of God †.

Chrysostom also says, that “ many heathens, when they hear that God was born in the flesh, laugh at us, and disturb and affright the more simple ‡,” thinking it unworthy of God §.

\* Ταῦτα καὶ νῦν ζηλοῦσι τινες Ἑλληνικὴν καὶ Ἰουδαϊκὴν νόσον νοσούντες, καὶ μὴ παραδεχόμενοι, μηδὲ πιστευόντες ὅπως σωματίζεσθαι θεόν, ἀλλο λογισμοῖς ἀνθρωπίνους, καὶ φιλονεικίαν. καὶ φιλοσοφίαν Ἑλληνικὴν γινώσκοντες. καὶ καταλαβεῖν μάλλον βυλομένοι τὰ μεγάλα καὶ ἀκαταλήπτα. πῶς γενναῖαι τοῦ σώματος· πῶς δὲ καὶ προεῖσι· καὶ πῶς ὁ πάντα ἔχων, καὶ πάντα περιέχων, καὶ πάντα πληρὸν, καὶ ἐκ τῆς πῶς, καὶ ὅπως, εἰς ἀπίστην ἐκώρυχταν, καὶ ἀντὶ γεννησεως ἐπλάσαντο ποιήσιν, καὶ ἀντὶ προοδὸς κινήσιν, καὶ παροδὸν καίσκειναι. Unum esse Christum, Opera, vol. 1. p. 665.

† Ἐπειδὴ δὲ καὶ ὁ σοφιστὴς Λιβανίου, ἐπιχλευάζων, τὸν ἐκ Παλαιστίνης, φησιν, ἀνθρώπον, θεὸν τε, καὶ θεοῦ παῖδα ποιεῖσιν. Socratis Hist. lib. 3 cap. 23. p. 203.

‡ Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ πολλοὶ ἐλλήνων, ἀκούοντες ὅτι θεὸς ἐἴεχθη ἐν σαρκί, καὶ ἀγγελῶσι, διασυρόντες, καὶ πολλὰς τῶν ἀφελεστερῶν δορυβασίαι καὶ τὰ ῥαίτεσι. Ser 31. Opera, vol. 5. p. 476.

§ Ἀπρεπὲς θεῷ. Ibid. p. 478.

## C H A P T E R IX.

*Of the Controversy relating to the Holy Spirit.*

**I**T is pretty remarkable, that, notwithstanding the doctrine concerning the *person of Christ*, had been the great subject of controversy ever since the promulgation of christianity, there is no mention made of any difference of opinion concerning the *Holy Spirit*, that attracted any notice, till after the commencement of the Arian controversy, and even till after the council of Nice. Basil observes, that “ the doctrine  
“ concerning the Holy Spirit, which made  
“ so much noise in his time, had not been  
“ agitated by the ancients ; and because they  
“ had been all of the same opinion about  
“ it, it had not been settled\* ” Now, as in all this period, it will appear that there were great numbers of *unitarians* (they be-

\* Επειδή δε το νυν ανακυφαν παρα των αι τι καινολογειν επιχει-  
ρευων ζήτημα, παρατιωπήσεν τοις παλαι, δια το ανανιρρητον, αδιαρ-  
ρητον κατελειφθη (λεγει δη το περι τῶ αγιῶ πνευματος). Epist. 387.  
Opera, vol. 3. p. 382.

ing the majority of the unlearned christians among the Gentiles, besides the whole body of the Jewish christians, who did not believe in any divinity except that of the Father) and this is never objected to them by their adversaries, who *do* censure them for not admitting the divinity of the Son, it is evident that the divinity of the Spirit had not been acknowledged even by those who had been deemed orthodox.

Even after the rise of the Arian controversy, many persons expressed themselves concerning the Spirit as if it had no proper divinity, at least of a personal nature, without censure, which could not have been the case, if it had been the uniform doctrine of the orthodox, that the Holy Spirit was a proper *divine person*, equal to the Son, or the Father. We may conclude, therefore, that it was the doctrine of the divinity of the Son which prepared the way for that of the Holy Spirit. But to enable us to judge from facts, I shall produce passages relating to the Holy Spirit from a considerable number of christian writers, in the order of time in which they wrote.

## SECTION I.

*Opinions concerning the Holy Spirit before the Council of Nice.*

THE sentiments of the Gnostics, with respect to the Holy Spirit, were never, that we find, much complained of. But indeed, we do not know very distinctly what they were, except that, from their general system, it may be concluded, that if they supposed him to be a person at all, he must have been one of their *æons*, derived, mediately, or immediately, from the Supreme Being; and this agrees with Athanasius's saying, that "Valentinus thought the Holy Spirit to be of the same rank with the angels \*."

\* Επειδὴ τὸν θεὸν καὶ τὸν χριστὸν ὠνομαστέον εἶλα τὰς ἀγγέλους, ἀναγκη τοῖς ἀγγέλοις συναριθμείσθαι τὸ πνεῦμα, τῆς τε αὐτῶν εἶναι συτοιχίας αὐτῷ καὶ ἀγγέλων εἶναι μεζονα τῶν ἄλλων· ὥρῳ μὲν ἐν τῆς ἀσεβείας ἐστὶν Οὐαλεντίνου τὸ εὐρημα· καὶ ἐκ ἐλαθὸν εἶποι τὰ ἐκεῖν' ὀφείλγοντο. ἐκεῖνος γὰρ φησι· οἱ πεμφθέντες τὰ παρὰ κλήσε, συναπεσταλῆσιν αὐτῷ οἱ ἡλικιώται αὐτῶ ἀγγελοι. Epist. Ad. Serapion, Opera, vol. i: p. 185.

We

We can have no dependence, as I have shewn, upon any arguments from the writings of the apostolical Fathers, except that of Clement, who makes no particular mention of the Holy Spirit. In the book ascribed to Hermas, he is made to say, “do not offend the Holy Spirit, lest he intreat God, and depart from thee\*.” According to this, the Holy Spirit must have been thought to be a *creature*, dependent upon God.

Ignatius, if his epistle to the Ephesians be genuine, considered the Holy Spirit as a *power*, rather than as a *person*. For he says, awkwardly enough, “We are raised upwards by the machine Jesus Christ, which is his cross, using the Holy Spirit as a rope †.”

Justin Martyr, to whom we are indebted for the first rudiments of the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, says but little concerning the Holy Spirit; and from that

\* Noli offendere spiritum sanctum, qui in te, habitat ne roget dominum, et recedat a te. Mand. 10. sect. 3. p. 97.

† Αναφερομενοι εις τα υψηλ δια της μηχανης Ιησους χριστου, ο εστιν σταυρος, σχοινα χρησμενοι τα πνευματα τα αγια. Sect. 9. p. 14.

little, it is not easy to conclude what his real opinion was. But it is probable that he considered the Spirit as a created being, since he represents him as inferior to Christ. “But him, and the Son who comes from him, and teaches us these things, and the hosts of good angels which follow them, and agree with them” (meaning perhaps, other valuable truths of an important nature) “and the prophetic spirit, we reverence and adore, honouring them in word and deed \*.” Speaking of Christ as “the Son of the true God, and to be honoured in the second place,” he says, “we honour the prophetic spirit in the third place, after the logos †.”

Irenæus seems to have considered the Holy Spirit as a divine influence, and no proper person. “By the name of Christ,” he says, “we are given to understand one who anoints, one who is anointed, and

\* Ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνον τε καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ υἱὸν ἐλθόντα, καὶ διδάξαντά ἡμᾶς ταῦτα, καὶ τὸν τῶν ἀγγέλων ἐπομένων καὶ ἐξομωμένων ἀγαθῶν ἀγγελῶν στρατῶν, πνεῦμα τε τὸ προφητικὸν σεβόμεθα, καὶ προσκυνούμεν, λόγῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τιμῶντες. *Apol. i. p. 11.*

† Ὅτιον αὐτὸς τε οὕτως θεὸς μαθόντες καὶ ἐν δευτέρᾳ χάρα εχόντες, πνεῦμα τε προφητικὸν ἐν τρίτῃ τάξει οὐ μέλα λόγῳ τιμῶμεν. *Ibid. p. 19.*



“ the unction with which he is anointed.  
 “ It is the Father who anoints, but the  
 “ Son is anointed, in the Spirit, which is  
 “ the unction ; as the word says by *Isaiah*,  
 “ The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, be-  
 “ cause he has anointed me ; signifying  
 “ the Father anointing, the Son who is  
 “ anointed, and the unction, which is the  
 “ Spirit \*.”

Again, speaking of the fleece of *Gideon* which continued dry, he says, “ it is a  
 “ type of the people, who would afterwards  
 “ be dry, not having the Holy Spirit from  
 “ God, as *Isaiah* says, and I will order the  
 “ clouds that they shall not rain upon thee,  
 “ but in all the earth there shall be dew,  
 “ which is the Spirit of God, which de-  
 “ scended upon our Lord ; the spirit of  
 “ wisdom and understanding, the spirit of

\* In Christi enim nomine subauditur qui unxit, et ipse qui unctus est, et in ipsa unctio in qua unctus est. Et unxit quidem pater, unctus est vero filius, in spiritu, qui est unctio ; quemadmodum per *Esaïam* ait sermo : spiritus Dei super me, propter quod unxit me ; significans et ungentem patrem, et unctum filium, et unctionem, qui est spiritus. Lib. 3. cap. 20. p. 246.

“ counsel and might; the spirit of know-  
 “ ledge and piety, the spirit of the fear of  
 “ God, which he would again give to the  
 “ church, sending the Paraclete from hea-  
 “ ven upon all the earth \*.”

Theophilus gives us no idea of a person, much less a divine one, when he speaks of the “ spirit that moved upon the face of the “ water, as something imparted to the crea- “ tion to vivify it, as the soul does the “ body, the spirit being something atte- “ nuated, imparted to the water, which is “ thin and fluid also, that the spirit may “ nourish the water, and the water added “ to the spirit may nourish all creation, “ prevading it †.”

\* Quod erat typus populi, ariditatem futuram prophe-  
 tans; hoc est, non jam habituros eos a Deo spiritum  
 sanctum, sicut Elaias ait: et nubibus mandabo ne pluant  
 super eam; in omni autem terra fieri ros, quod est spi-  
 ritus Dei, qui descendit in dominum, spiritus sapientiæ et  
 intellectus, spiritus consilii, et virtutis, spiritus scientiæ et  
 pietatis, spiritus timoris Dei: quem ipsum iterum dedit  
 ecclesiæ, in omnem terram mittens de cœlis paracletum.  
 Lib. 3. cap. 20. p. 244.

† Πνευμα δε το επιφερομενον επανω της υδατος ο εδωκεν ο θεος εις  
 ζωογονησιν τη κησει, καθαπερ ανθρωπω ψυχην τω λεπτιω το λεπτιον συγ-  
 κεραισας.

Athenagoras considered the Holy Spirit as an efflux from the Deity, flowing out and drawn into him again at pleasure, as a beam from the sun\*. This was that kind of existence that Justin Martyr says some persons ascribed to the divinity of the Son, and which constituted, as I shall show hereafter, what may be called the philosophical unitarianism of that age.

Tertullian seems to have thought that the Holy Spirit was derived from Christ, in the same manner as Christ was derived from God, that is by a kind of *prolation*. “The Spirit,” says he, “is the third from the Father, and the Son; as the fruit is the third from the root, and the branch; as the rivulet is the third from the fountain and the river, and the apex the third from the sun and its beam. For

κερασας. το γαρ πνευμα λεπτιον η το υδωρ λεπτιον, οπως το μεν πνευμα τρεφει το υδωρ · το δε υδωρ συν τω πνευματι τρεφει την κησιν, διανεμενον πανταχοτε. Lib. 2. p. 98.

\* Και τοι η αυτο το ενεργειν τοις εκφωνεσι προφητικως αγιον πνευμα, απορροειν ειναι φαμεν τς θες, απορρεον η επαναφερομενοι, ως ακινητα ηλιας. Apol. p. 84. 218.

“ none of these are separated from their  
 “ sources, from which they derive their  
 “ properties. So the Trinity running, by  
 “ connected degrees, from the Father, is no  
 “ hindrance to a monarchy, and yet a pro-  
 “ tection to the oeconomy\*.”

In another passage, he seems to confound the Spirit with the logos, supposing the spirit of God by which the Virgin Mary was overshadowed to have been the word. “ By not  
 “ calling him God directly,” he says, “ he  
 “ means a portion of the whole, which will  
 “ obtain the name of the Son. This Spirit  
 “ of God is the same as the word; as  
 “ John says, *The word was made flesh*. We  
 “ also understand the Spirit when the word  
 “ is mentioned; for the Spirit is the sub-  
 “ stance of the word, and the word is the

\* Tertius enim est spiritus a Deo et filio, sicut tertius a radice fructus ex frutice; et tertius a fonte, rivus ex flumine; et tertius a sole, apex ex radio. Nihil tamen a matrice alienatur, a qua proprietates suas ducit. Ita trinitas per confertos et connexos gradus a patre decurrens et monarchiæ nihil obstrepat, et œconomix statum protegit. Adv. Praxeam, sect. 8. p. 504.

“ operation of the Spirit, and they two are  
 “ one\*.” Eusebius says that λογος and πνευμα  
*the word*, and *the Spirit*, mean the same  
 thing with respect to God †.

It was supposed by the ancients, that the Spirit appeared in the proper form of a dove at our Saviour’s baptism, and consequently it was a question to be determined what became of the body of this dove. Tertullian intimates, that “ as it was made  
 “ out of nothing, it might be resolved into  
 “ nothing, like the bodies of angels ‡.

Hippolytus perhaps considered the Spirit as a person; but it is not quite certain. “ Why,” says he, “ should any one say that

\* Tamen non directo deum nominans, portionem totius intelligi voluit, quæ cessura erat in filii nomen. Hic spiritus Dei idem erit sermo. Sicut enim Joanne dicente, sermo caro factus est; spiritum quoque intelligimus in mentione sermonis: ita et hic sermonem quoque agnoscimus in nomine spiritus. Nam et spiritus est substantia sermonis, et sermo operatio spiritus, et duo unum sunt. Ad Praxeam, sect. 26. p. 515.

† In Pl. Montfaucon, vol. 1.

‡ Sed quæris corpus columbæ ubi sit, resumpto spiritu in cœlum; æque et angelorum; eadem ratione interceptum est, qua et editum fuerat; si vidisses cum de nihilo proferebatur, scisses, cum in nihilum subducebatur. De Carne Christi, sect. 3. p. 309.

“ we teach two Gods. I do not say there  
 “ are two Gods, but one, and two per-  
 “ sons, also the third œconomy, the grace  
 “ of the Holy Spirit. For the Father  
 “ is one, but two persons; because there  
 “ is a Son, and the third is the Holy  
 “ Spirit\*.” “ This is the Spirit that  
 “ moved upon the face of the waters, by  
 “ which the world is moved, by which the  
 “ creation consists, and all things receive  
 “ life†.”

Origen considered it as doubtful, whether, since all things are made by Christ, the Holy Spirit was not made by him. And after discussing the question a little, he says, “ we who maintain three hypostases,  
 “ the Father, Son, and Spirit, and believe  
 “ that the Father only is unbegotten, think  
 “ it more agreeable to piety and truth, to  
 “ maintain that the Holy Spirit is superior

\* Τι ἂν φησιν αὐ τὶς δύο λεγεῖν θεοὺς; δύο μὲν ἐκ ἐρω θεοὺς, ἀλλὰ ἢ ἓνα, πρῶτον τε δύο, οἰκονομίαν δὲ τρίτην, τὴν χάριν τε ἁγίαν πνευ-  
 μάτος. Πάτηρ μὲν γὰρ εἷς, πρῶτον τε δύο, διὸ καὶ ὁ υἱός, τὸ δὲ τρίτον  
 τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. Ad Noetum, sect. 14. Opera, vol. 2. p. 15.

† Ἐξ ὧν δὲ ἐστὶν τὸ πνεῦμα, τὸ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐπιφερόμενον ἐπάνω τῶν  
 ὑδάτων. διὸ καὶ κόσμος κινεῖται, διὸ καὶ κτίσις ἰσχύει καὶ τὰ συμπάντα ζωογον-  
 εῖσθαι. Hom. in Theophaniam, Opera, p. 264.

“ to

“ to all things that were made by Christ ;  
 “ and that the only reason why he is not  
 “ called a *son* of God, is that the only be-  
 “ gotten Son had obtained that title, which  
 “ the Holy Spirit wanted, being subser-  
 “ vient to his nature, not only with respect  
 “ to his *being*, but to his being wise and  
 “ rational, and righteous, and every thing  
 “ else that he is understood to be. But I  
 “ think that the Holy Spirit, if I may so  
 “ speak, furnishes the materials of all the  
 “ gifts of God, which are distributed by  
 “ Christ. We acknowledge, however, that  
 “ there is room to doubt of this ; since  
 “ whatever is made is said to have been  
 “ made by Christ, and that, in some places,  
 “ the Holy Spirit seems to have been con-  
 “ sidered as superior to Christ ; especially as,  
 “ in Isaiah, Christ himself confesses that he  
 “ was sent by the Holy Spirit, as well as  
 “ by the Father,” Is. xlviii. 16. “ and like-  
 “ wise that blasphemy against the Holy  
 “ Spirit is more dangerous than blasphemy  
 “ against the Son\*.”

\* Ημεῖς μένλοιγε τρεῖς υποστάσεις πειθόμενοι τυγχάνειν, τοῦ πατέρα,  
 καὶ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, καὶ ἀγεννήτου μηδὲν ἕτερον τὰ πάλους εἶναι

Afterwards he makes a distinction between those things which God made *in wisdom*, and those made *by wisdom*, i. e. by the Son\*, as if the Spirit had been made by God without the instrumentality of Christ. The following passage is not more determinate. “For the Saviour made both one, and “he being the first fruits of those things that

πιστευοντες, ως ευσεβεςερων κ' αληθες, προστιμεθα το, παλιν δια τς λογς γενομενων, το αγιον πνευμα παλιν ειναι τιμιωτερον, κ' ταξει παλιν των υπο τς πατρος δια χρις γεγενημενων. κ' ταχα αυτη εστι η αιτια τς μη κ' αυτο υιον χρηματιζειν τς δεξ, μονς τς μονογενους φυσει υις αρχηδεν τυγχανοντος, & χρηζειν εοικε το αγιον πνευμα, διακονενθ' αυτς τη υποσασει, & μονον εις το ειναι, αλλα κ' σοφον ειναι κ' λογικον, κ' δικαιον, κ' παν ολιποδεν χρη αυτο νοειν τυγχανειν, καλα μελοχην των προειρημενων ημιν χρις επινοιαν· οιμαι δε το αγιον πνευμα την, ιν' εως ειπω, υλην των απο δεξ χαρισματων παρεχειν τοις δι αυτο κ' την μελοχην αυτς χρηματιζουσιν αγιοις, της ειρημενης υλης των χαρισματων, ενεργεμενης μεν απο τς δεξ, διακονεμενης κ' υπο τς χρις, υφεσωσης δε καλα το αγιον πνευμα.—Εχει δε επαπορησιν δια τε το, παλιν δι αυτς εγενετο, κ' ακολουθειν το πνευμα γεννητον υν, δια τς λογς γεγενεσθαι, πως οιοει προδιμασαι τς χρις εν τισι γραφαις, εν μεν τω Ησαια ομολογενθ' χρις, εκ υπο τς πατρος απεσθαι μονς, αλλα κ' υπο τς αγις πνευματος, φησι γαρ κ' νυν κυριος απεστειλε με κ' το πνευμα αυτς. εν δε τω ευαγγελιω αφεσιν μεν επαγγελλομενς επι της εις αυτον αμαρτιας, αποφαινμενς δε περι της εις το αγιον πνευμα βλασφημιας. Comment. vol. 2. p. 57.

\* Παντα γαρ φησιν, εν σοφια εποησας, & δια της σοφιας εποησας. Ibid. p. 59.

“ are



“are made one, I mean of those whose souls  
 “are mixed with the Holy Spirit, and  
 “each of those who are saved becomes  
 “spiritual\*.”

It is evident, from the uncertainty in which Origen appears to have been with respect to this subject, that in his time the doctrine of the church was by no means fixed, and that those who were deemed orthodox thought themselves at liberty to think and write as they pleased about it, without any danger of *heresy*.

Novatian, who had as much orthodoxy with respect to the trinity as any person of his age, certainly did not believe in the divinity of the Holy Spirit, whom he represents as inferior to the Son, whom also he makes greatly inferior to the Father. “Christ,” says he, “is greater than the

\* Πεποίηκε γὰρ ὁ σωτὴρ τὰ ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐν, κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν γινομένων ἀμφοτέρων ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ πάντων ποιήσας· ἀμφοτέρων δὲ λέγω καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἐφ’ ὧν ἀνακεκράται τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι ἡ ἐκάστη ψυχή, καὶ γεγενῆς ἐκαστος τῶν ζωζομένων πνευματικός. Comment. vol. 2. p. 30.

“Paraclete;

“ Paraclete; for he would not receive of  
 “ Christ, if he was not less than he \*.”

We are not able to trace with certainty the opinion of Cyprian on this subject. But, as he says that it was Christ who spake by the prophets †, he seems to have had no distinct office for the Spirit, and, therefore, probably thought that Christ himself was that Spirit.

It is enumerated among the faults of Lactantius, that “ he makes no mention  
 “ of the Holy Spirit, and that, in his  
 “ epistles to Demetrianus, as Jerom says,  
 “ he denied the personality of the Spirit;  
 “ and according to a Jewish error, con-  
 “ founded him either with the Father or  
 “ the Son ‡.”

\* Major ergo jam Paraclete Christus est: quoniam nec Paracletus a Christo acciperet, nisi minor Christo esset. Cap. 16. p. 56.

† Sed quanto majora sunt quæ filius loquitur, quæ Dei sermo, qui in prophetis fuit, propria voce testatur. De Oratione Dominica, Opera, p. 139.

‡ *Nævi Lactantii et errores*—Quod spiritum sanctum ne quidem nominet: imo quod in epistolis ad Demetrianum, autore Hieronymo, spiritus sancti substantiam negavit;

“ Dionysius of Alexandria,” who is often called the father of Arianism, “ spake  
 “ very improperly,” says Basil, “ with re-  
 “ spect to the Holy Spirit, and not admit-  
 “ ting of his divinity, reduced him to the  
 “ rank of a created and servile nature \*.”

Eusebius, who appears to have been as orthodox as other writers of his age with respect to the Son (if his writings may be allowed to testify for him) and who certainly was not *bold in heresy*, scrupled not to consider the Spirit as made by the Son. “ The Holy Spirit,” says he, “ is neither  
 “ God, nor the Son, because he did not  
 “ derive his birth from the Father, like  
 “ the Son; but is one of the things that  
 “ was made by the Son; because all things  
 “ were made by him, and without him

gavit; et errore Judaice dixit, eum vel ad Patrem referri, vel ad filium; et sanctificationem utriusque personæ sub ejus nomine demonstrari. *Synthesis Doctrinæ Lactantii*, p. 899.

\* Προς δε τούτους καὶ περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος ἀρῆκε φωνάς, καί τις ἀρεπασας τῷ πνεύματι. τῆς προσκυνημένης αὐτοῦ θεότητος ἐξοριζών, καὶ κατὰ τὴν κτίσιν καὶ λειτουργίαν φυσικῶν συνριθμῶν. καὶ οὐ μὲν ἀνὴρ, τοιοῦτος. *Letter to Magnus in Nicephorus's History*, lib. 6. cap. 25. vol. 1. p. 419.

“ was

“ was nothing made \*.” He also speaks of the Holy Spirit as “ holding the third  
 “ place, as receiving from the logos, and  
 “ imparting valuable gifts to inferior be-  
 “ ings, just as the logos receives every  
 “ thing from the Supreme Being †.”

Even Hilary, who wrote so largely concerning the divinity of the Son, seems not to have had the same persuasion concerning that of the Holy Spirit ; but, in the little that he says on the subject, seems rather to have considered the Spirit as a divine influence. He represents our Saviour commanding the apostles to baptize in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as signifying “ a confession  
 “ of the Father, of the only begotten, and

\* Το δε παρακλητον πνεύμα, ἦν θεος, ἦν υἱος· ἐπεὶ μὴ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ὁμοίως τῷ υἱῷ καὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν γενεσὶν εἰλησεν. ἐν δὲ τι τῶν δια τῆς υἱὸς γενομένων τυγχάνει, ὅτι δὲ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγενέσθω, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγενέσθω οὐδε ἐν. *Ec. Theol. lib. 3. cap. 4. p. 175.*

† Ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν, τρεῖς ἐπεχόν τὴν τάξιν, τοῖς υποβέβη-  
 κوسي τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ κρείττονων δυνάμεων ἐπιχωρηγεῖ, ἔμειν ἀλλὰ  
 καὶ ἀγλιμασθάνει παρ' ἑτέρου τοῦ, ἢ παρὰ θεοῦ λόγου, τὸ δὲ καὶ  
 ἀναφέρω καὶ κρείττονος, ὃν δὴ δευτερεύειν ἐραμεν τῆς ἀνώτατης  
 καὶ ἀγεννήτης φύσεως θεοῦ τοῦ παμβασιλέως. *Preparatio, lib. 7. cap. 15. p. 325.*

“ of the gift \*,” which very much resembles what Irenæus says on the subject.

They who said that the Holy Spirit was created by the Son, held that there was a time when only one divine person existed ; and again, that there was a time when only two existed, the Holy Spirit not being made †.

## SECTION II.

*Opinions concerning the Holy Spirit after the  
Council of Nice.*

**I**T was Athanasius, the great advocate for the divinity of Christ, and his consubstantiality with the Father, who also exerted himself strenuously and effectually in behalf of that of the Holy Spirit, whose

\* Baptizare iussit in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti : id est, in confessione et authoris, et unigeniti, et doni. Lib. 2. p. 22.

† Αναθεματίζομεν τας φρονεσεις και λεγοντας• ην ποτε μονας, μη υιός υιός• και ην ποτε δυας, μη υιός αγιός πνευματός. Eugenii Legatio ad Athanasium in Montfaucon's Collectio Patrum, vol. 2. p. 3.

divinity

divinity was denied by Macedonius. He informs us, that he was in the deserts of Egypt when he heard of that heresy, and that he wrote from thence to prevent the spread of it \*. He had so much influence in Egypt, that a synod was immediately called there, which he attended, and where the Holy Spirit was for the first time decreed to be consubstantial with the Father and the Son †.

Not long after this, the divinity of the Holy Spirit was more solemnly determined at a council held in Constantinople, and from that time it was deemed equally heretical to deny the divinity of the Spirit, as that of the Son. The doctrine of the trinity now began to assume a proper form

\* Εγώ μὲν ἐν, καὶ περ ἐν ἐρημῷ διαγών, διὰ τὴν ἐν τῇ ἀναιδείᾳ τῶν ἐκτραπέντων ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας· ἔφροντιζας τῶν γελαῶν ἐθελόντων. διὰ τὸ ἀδελφές καὶ ταπεινὸν τῆς διὰ τῶν λόγων ἐπιδείξεως· δι' ὀλίγων γραφῶς, ἀπέστειλα τὴν εὐλαβείαν, παρακαλῶν ἵνα ἐντυγχάνωσι τοῖς τὰ μὲν διορθώσεως· ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς ἀδελφῶς εἰρημικοῖς συγγινώσκῃς. Ad Separation, Opera, vol. 1. p. 207.

† Ἐν τῷ δὲ πολλῶν πόλεων ἐπισκοποὶ συνελθόντες εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν, ἀμὰ Ἀθανασίῳ καὶ Εὐσεβίῳ, τὰ δεδωγμένα ἐν Νίκαιᾳ κρατυνέουσιν. ὁμοσίῳ τε τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ υἱῷ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ὁμολογήσαν, καὶ τριάδα ὀνόμασαν. Sozomen. lib. 5. cap. 12. p. 198.

and

and consistence, one part of the scheme coming in aid of the other ; and there were distinct treatises to prove the divinity of the Spirit, which had never been the subject of discussion before. Then was the doctrine of the perfect equality of the Spirit, and the Son, as well as that of the Son and the Father, fully established ; so that among others, Epiphanius asserts that, Whatever is said of the Son is also said of the Spirit, as that they are both *sent*, they both *speak*, they both *sanctify*, they both *heal*, they both *baptize*, &c. and we are *justified* by them both, &c. &c. &c. \*

Still the forms of public worship were unfavourable to the new doctrine, for it had from time immemorial been the custom to *give glory* to the Father only ; but about this time, it is said, that “ Flavianus  
“ of Antioch, having assembled a number of  
“ monks, first shouted out, *Glory to the Fa-*  
“ *ther, to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit*, but  
“ that before him, some had said glory to  
“ the Father through the Son, in the Holy  
“ Spirit, which was the most customary

\* Ancoratus, sect. 68. Opera, vol. 2. p. 71. 73.

“ form ;

“ form ; and others, Glory to the Father  
 “ in the Son, and the Holy Spirit \*.”

But the new doctrine soon bore down the old forms, especially by the influence of Basil, and the two Gregories, his cotemporaries, who exerted themselves as strenuously in this business as Athanasius had ever done with respect to the divinity of the Son. Basil even maintained, that “ to  
 “ deny the divinity of the Holy Spirit, is  
 “ to be guilty of blasphemy against the  
 “ Holy Spirit †.” In former times we have seen that many persons were deemed orthodox who only held the divinity of the Son ; but Chrysostom says, “ it cannot be  
 “ that he who halts with respect to the  
 “ Spirit, can walk upright with respect to

\* Οτι φησι τον αντιοχειας φλαβιανον, πληθος μοναχων συναγειραντα, πρωτον αναδουσαι, δοξα πατρι και υιω και αγιω πνευματι . των γαρ προ αυτε, τες μεν, δοξα πατρι δι υιου εν αγιω πνευματι, λεγειν . και ταυτην μαλλον την εκφωνησιν επιπολαζειν . τες δε, δοξα πατρι εν υιω και αγιω πνευματι . Philostorgius, lib. 3. sect. 15. p. 496.

† Εκεινο δ' αν ηδεως αυτες εφ' υμων ερωτησαιμι, και διοριζομαι πεποιθοτας, οτι μεταμελησει σοι ποτε της αδεα ταυτης σοφιας, κτισμα λεγοντι το πνευμα το αγιον . ε φοβη την ασυγχωρητον αμαρτιαν ; η τι ποτε οει δυσσεβεσενον τετε δυσσεναι βλασφημειν . Hom. 27. Opera, vol. 1. p. 525.

“ the



“ the Son \*.” The description of the Spirit, as issuing from the substance of the Father, from this time very much resembled the former accounts of the generation of the Son from the Father. Thus Cyril of Alexandria says, “ The Holy Spirit is  
“ the Spirit of the unbegotten God, and  
“ comes forth from him, has personality  
“ and life, and always exists, being from  
“ that which exists †.”

At this time the formerly innocent doctrine of the Spirit having been created by the Son, or of his being inferior to him, was severely reprobated. Austin says, “ he  
“ remembered to have read in some work  
“ of Eusebius, that the Spirit did not un-  
“ derstand the mystery of our Saviour’s  
“ nativity, and he wondered that a man

\* *Αληθινον δὲ εἶναι τὸν περὶ τὸ πνεῦμα σκεζόντα ὀρθο-  
ποιστὰν περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ.* De Spiritu Sancto, Opera, vol. 6.  
p. 219.

† *Καὶ γὰρ εἰναι ἀγνοῦντε πνεύμαδες, ἰδίον αὐτῆ, καὶ ἐξ  
αὐτῆ πρῶτον, ἐκπορεύον τε, καὶ ζῶν, καὶ ἀπὶ οὗ, ὅτι τῆ  
ἐντὶ εἶναι.* Contra Julianum, lib. 8. Juliani Opera, vol. 2.  
p. 275.

“ of his learning should fix such a blot on  
 “ the Holy Spirit \*.”

Austin had been led into the belief of the divinity of Christ by the principles of Plato, as he expressly acknowledged ; but he owns that Platonism was not very favourable to the doctrine of the divinity of the Spirit. He says, “ that he found two  
 “ principles in Plato, God the Father and  
 “ the Son, or the divine mind ; but he  
 “ found nothing concerning the Holy Spi-  
 “ rit, and what the Platonists said of the  
 “ third principle he did not understand †.” Indeed, here it is that Platonism entirely fails those who wish so much to avail them-

\* Memini me in quodam libello Eusebii quondam egregii in reliquis viri, legisse, quia nec spiritus sanctus sciat mysterium nativitatis domini nostri Jesu Christi, et admiror tantæ doctrinæ virum hanc maculam spiritu sancto inflixisse. *Questiones Mixtæ. Opera*, vol. 4. p. 865.

† Quæ autem dicat esse principia tanquam Platonicus, novimus. Dicit enim Deum patrem et Deum filium, quem Græce appellat paternum intellectum, vel paternam mentem: de spiritu autem sancto, aut nihil, aut non aperte aliquid dicit: quamvis quem alium dicat horum medium, non intelligo. *De Civitate Dei*, lib. 10. cap. 23. *Opera*, vol. 5. p. 577.

selfes

selves of it. For the *third principle* of Plato was nothing belonging to the Deity, but either the world, or the soul of the world. “Plato’s third principle,” says Eusebius, “is the soul of the world\*.” And as the world, and the soul of the world, were sometimes considered as different principles, the Platonic principles are sometimes said to be *four*. Justin Martyr says, that “Plato sometimes said there “were four principles, making the soul of “the universe the fourth, and sometimes “he held matter to be created, and again “to be uncreated†.” Cyril of Alexandria, after mentioning Plato’s three principles, “God, idea, and matter,” says, “there is a fourth, which he calls the soul “of the world‡.”

\* Και τρίτην την τε κοσμος ψυχην θεον τρίτον η αυτην οριζομενοι ειναι. Preparatio, lib. 11. cap. 19. p. 541.

† Πλε δε τεσσαρας· προτιθησι γαρ η την καθολικη ψυχην. η αυτις την υλην αγεννητον προτερον ειρητως, υστερον γεννητην αυτην ειναι λεγει. Ad Græcos, p. 8.

‡ Τρεις δε παλιν ο Πλάτων τας των ολων αρχας ειναι λεγων, θεον τε και υλην, και ειδος, προτεταγει και τεταρτην, ην δη και ολε ψυχην ονομαζει. Con. Jul. lib. 2. Juliani Opera, vol. 2. p. 48.

Still, however, the orthodox christians were very desirous of making out something of a trinity in the doctrine of Plato; and Justin Martyr and others imagined they saw it so clearly, that they were confident it must have been derived from the scriptures. Thus Clemens Alexandrinus imagined, from his construction of the language of Plato, that he had a knowledge of the trinity, and that he learned it from Moses, alledging the two passages that have been already quoted from Plato, viz. that concerning *the oath* in the epistle to Erasmus, &c. and that concerning *the king of all*, in the epistle to Dionysius, which may be seen in vol. 1. p. 334. 350 \*. But this has been shewn to be a thing very different from the christian trinity.

\* Σιωπῶ γὰρ Πλάτωνα. ἀνέμους υἱὸς ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐραστον καὶ Κορίνθου ἐπιστολῇ φαίνεται πατέρα καὶ υἱόν, καὶ οὐδ' ὅπως, ἐκ τῶν ἑβραϊκῶν γραφῶν ἐμφαινῶν — Ὡς καὶ ἔπαιε εἶπῃ, περὶ τοῦ πάντων Βασιλέως πατέρα ἐστὶ. καθεὶς ἐνεκὲν τὰ πάντα · καθεὶς αἷλιον ἀπάντων καλῶν · δευτέρου δέ, περὶ τὰ δευτέρα · καὶ τρίτον, περὶ τὰ τρίτα · καὶ ἀλλῶς ἐγώ γε ἔξεκω, ἡ τὴν ἁγίαν τριάδα μνησθῆναι · τρίτον μὲν γὰρ εἶναι, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα · τὸν υἱὸν δέ, δευτέρου, διὰ τὰ πάντα ἐγενέτο καὶ αὐτὸς βεβλήσιν τὰ πάντα. Strom. lib. 5. p. 598.

The resemblance between the christian and the Platonic trinity is very imperfect, as it fails entirely in both the essential circumstances. For it was never imagined that the three component members of the Platonic trinity were either *equal* to each other, or strictly speaking *one*. But then, neither had this been the language of those who introduced the doctrine of the trinity. For they went little farther than the proper principles of Plato, without pretending either to make a perfect *equality*, or a perfect *unity* of the three persons; and therefore, they did not maintain that this doctrine was so very *mysterious* and *unintelligible* as it was afterwards represented to be.

Notwithstanding the doctrine of the trinity seemed to be completed by means of the divinity and personality of the Spirit, and in some respects it seemed better guarded against attacks, there were still some awkward circumstances attending it. The Spirit being a divine person as well as the Son, and yet, like the Son, not absolutely underived, there was some difficulty in settling the mode of his derivation. The

term *generation* had been already appropriated to the Son, and it had also been settled that there could be only *one son* produced in that manner, Christ being denominated *the only begotten Son of God*. Fortunately the Spirit was said to *proceed* from the Father, or the Son, or from both; and though, in the scriptures, this meant nothing more than his being *sent* by the Father, or the Son; and this being *sent* was only a figurative expression, denoting the imparting those powers which came from God, this term *proceeding* was immediately laid hold of, as expressing the manner of the emission of the Spirit from the fountain of deity, and was deemed to be different from *generation*. But then there was great difficulty in determining in what that difference consisted. “The nativity of the Son,” says Austin, “differs from the procession of the Spirit, otherwise they would be brothers\*.”

\* Sic enim videbis quid distet nativitas verbi Dei a processione doni Dei, propter quod filius unigenitus non de patre genitum, alioquin frater ejus esset, sed procedere dixit spiritum sanctum. De Trinitate, lib. 15. cap. 27, Opera, vol. 3. p. 476.

But

But notwithstanding all the ingenuity of the orthodox, nothing more than a mere verbal distinction could ever be made between a mysterious *generation* and an equally mysterious *procession*. “What is the difference,” says the Macedonian, in the dialogue on this subject, ascribed to Athanasius, “between *generated* and *proceeding*.” The orthodox disputant answers “Do not inquire into this difference, for it is incomprehensible. Attend to what is commanded you, and inquire no farther. You are commanded to believe that the Son is begotten, and that the Spirit proceeded. All other things, as the heaven, the earth, the sea, and things rational, and irrational, are creatures \*.”

It was generally thought, however, that there was something more intelligible in the

\* Και τις η διαφορα της γεννησεως κ' της εκπορευσεως; ΟΡΘ. Την διαφοραν μη περιεργαζε· ε γαρ καλαληπτη, αλλ' α προσελαγη σοι, ταυτα διανε, κ' περαιτερω τετων μη εξελαζε. Προσελαγη δε σοι το πιστευειν, οτι ο υιος γενωται, κ' το πνευμα εκπορευεσθαι. Τα δε αλλα παυλα, υφανος, γη θαλασσα, κ' τα εν αυλοις λογικα κ' αλογα, κτισματια εισι, καί ενλογην αυτη τε θεε κτισθεντα. Opera, vol. 2. p. 276.

doctrine of *generation* than in that of *procession*. For Basil says, “The Son is produced from the Father by generation, “but the Spirit in an ineffable manner\*.” There is an air of still greater modesty in what Gr. Nazianzen says on the subject. “It is peculiar,” says he, “to the Father “to be unbegotten, to the Son to be begotten, and to the Holy Spirit to proceed. If you inquire the manner *why*, “should you not leave it to themselves, “who have declared that they only know “each other, and to those of us who may “be illuminated about it hereafter†.”

Austin says that the Holy Spirit, being the Spirit of both the Father and the Son, proceeds from them both; and this he makes to be the difference between the generation of the Son, and the procession of the Spirit. “It is peculiar,” he says, “to the son of

\* Ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν υἱός, ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννητός· τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα, ἀρρήτως ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Hom. 27. Opera, vol. 1. p. 526.

† Ἴδιον δὲ, πατρὸς μὲν, ἢ ἀγεννησία, υἱὸς δὲ ἢ γεννησις, πνευματικὸς δὲ, ἢ ἐκπεμφσις. εἰ δὲ τὸν τρόπον ἐπιζητήσεις, τί καταλείψεις τοῖς μονοῖς γινώσκειν ἀλλήλους, καὶ γινώσκεισθαι ὑπ' ἀλλήλων μαρτυρουμένοις, ἢ καὶ ἡμῶν τοῖς ἐκείθεν ἐλλαμψόμενοις ὑπερῶν. Or. 23. Opera, p. 422.



“man to proceed from two,” meaning of different sexes. “Far be this from the Son  
“of God, &c.\*”

Cyril of Alexandria seems to think that he had some idea of the nature of the procession of the Spirit from the substance of God, when he says, that “Christ breathed  
“upon his disciples, to shew that the  
“Holy Spirit proceeds from the divine substance, as the breath of man proceeds from  
“him †.”

There was likewise another difficulty with respect to the Holy Spirit being said to be *sent by the Son*, from which some con-

\* Quæro quid distat inter nativitatem filii et processionem spiritus sancti? Filius autem solius est patris, non spiritus sancti. Amborum inquam spiritus, id est patris et filii. Quod si spiritus, sanctus filius esse diceretur, nullus autem filius est nisi duorum, patris et matris, quod absit ut sit inter deum patrem et filium tale quid suspicemur, quia nec filius hominis simul ex patre procedit et ex matre. Questiones, 65. Opera, vol. 4. p. 679.

† Sed quemadmodum unusquisque nostrum, proprium in seipso spiritum continet, et ab intimis visceribus ad exteriora profundit: propterea corporaliter Christus sufflavit: ostendens hoc signo, quia quemadmodum ab ore humano corporaliter humanus spiritus procedit, sic ex divina substantia deitati congruenter spiritus, qui ab ea est, profunditur. In Joan lib. 9. p. 936.

cluded

cluded that, in his origin, he issued from the Son, as well as from the Father; and this doctrine prevailed in the Latin church; whereas the Greeks held that the Spirit proceeded from the Father only. To the objection that if the Spirit be God, the Father has two Sons, Epiphanius replies, that “the Spirit proceedeth both from the Father and the Son\*.” Damascenus says, that “the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, and rests in the Son†.” But Basil seems to have considered the Spirit as deriving his being from the Son only. For he says, “As the Son is the *logos* of the Father, so the Spirit is the word [*ρημα*] of the Son. For it is said that he,” meaning the Son, “supporteth all things by the word of his power‡.” The ancients are said by M. Caleca to have believed that

\* Το δὲ ἅγιον πνεῦμα το παρ ἀμφότερων. Ancoratus, feci. 71. Opera, vol. 2. p. 75.

† Eodem modo etiam in spiritum sanctum credimus, qui dominus est, et vivificat, qui ex patre procedit, et in filio quiescit. Orthed. Fid. lib. 1. cap. 10. Opera, p. 268.

‡ Δια τοῦ καὶ θεοῦ μὲν λόγος ὁ υἱός, ρημα δὲ υἱοῦ το πνεῦμα. φερὼν γὰρ, φησι, τα πάντα τῷ ρηματι τῆς δυναμὸς αὐτοῦ. Ad Eunom. lib. 5. Opera, vol. 1. p. 787.

“the

“ the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father through the Son\*.” So miserably do men bewilder themselves, when they leave the path of simple truth, abandoning reason, to follow mere imagination.

### S E C T I O N III.

*Of the proper Office of the Spirit with respect to the Offices of the Father and the Son.*

**T**HERE being now *three* divine persons instead of *one*, there was a farther difficulty in adjusting their several provinces, for each divine person must have an employment suited to his character. This arrangement being left to men, who can seldom agree, a considerable difference of opinion unavoidably arose in this case. However, after much discussion, it was at

\* Και ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου ἐκ τῆς πατρὸς διὰ τῆς υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι λέγουσιν, οἱ αὐτοὶ τῆς πρώτης μετρὶ τῆς ἑσυνόδος διαλαμψάντες. Combe's Auctuarium, vol. 2. p. 216.

length settled, at least for a long time, that all the three divine persons acted jointly in every operation in which any of them was concerned. But before it was determined in this manner, divines were much employed in settling the proper department of the Holy Spirit, after having agreed before, that the Son was the maker of all things under the Father.

For some time it was generally thought that the Father was the only prime *cause*, the *fountain of deity*, the Son his immediate agent in the creation, and that the Spirit was the *sanctifier*, or the *perfecter* of every thing. “There are three,” says Basil, “the Father ordaining, the Son executing, and the Spirit perfecting\*.” “The Father,” says M. Caleca, “is distinguished as the primary cause, the Son as the creator, and and the Spirit as the perfecter †.”

\* Τρία ποιουν νοεις, τον προτασσουντα κυριον, τον δημιουργοντα λογον, τον τελειωνον το πνευμα το αγιον. De Sp. S. cap. 16. Opera, vol. 2. p. 325.

† Δια τωλον την προκαταρτικην αλιαν ανιτλομενος τον πατερα \* την δημιουργικην τον υιον \* την τελειωτικην, το πνευμα το αγιον. Combefis Auctuarium, vol. 2. p. 209.

It

It appears most clearly from Eusebius, that to *sanctify* and to *perfect* meant the same thing. In the interpretation of Pf. xxxiii. 6. *By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth*, he says, “By these we are to  
 “ understand our Saviour, and the Holy  
 “ Spirit, for both co-operated in the crea-  
 “ tion of the heavens and their host—For  
 “ nothing is sanctified without the pre-  
 “ sence of the Spirit. The *word*, being the  
 “ *demiurgus*, introduced the angels into be-  
 “ ing, but the Holy Spirit gave their *sancti-*  
 “ *fication*; for the angels were not created  
 “ infants\*.”

But though it had been settled by most of the Fathers, that the *logos*, or the Son, was the medium of all the divine communications of God to man in the Old Testa-

\* ἵνα νοηθῇ ὁ σῶτης καὶ τὸ ἅγιον αὐτῆς πνεῦμα. ἀμφότερα δὲ συνηργήσαν ἐν τῇ κτίσει τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς δυνάμεων· διὰ τοῦτο εἰρηλαί· τῷ λόγῳ κυρίου οἱ ἔθνη ἐξερρώθησαν καὶ τῷ πνεύματι τῆς ἡμετέρας αὐτῆς πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις αὐτῶν. ἔθεν γὰρ ἁγιαζέσθαι ἐμὴν τὴν παρρησίαν τῆς πνευμα- τοῦ. ἀγγέλων γὰρ τὴν μὲν εἰς τὸ εἶναι παροῦτον, ὁ δημιουργὸς λόγος ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ὅλων παρέχεται· τὸν ἁγιασμόν δὲ αὐτοῖς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον συνεπέφερεν· καὶ γὰρ νηπίοι κτισθέντες οἱ ἀγγελοι. Monfaucon's Collectio, vol. i. p. 124.

ment,

ment, it was now generally thought proper to take from him the province of inspiring the prophets, and to leave to him only the visible appearances to Abraham, Moses, and others. Irenæus says it was the Spirit of God that spake by the prophets and the apostles \*. Ambrose says, “ it was the  
 “ same spirit by which Moses and Aaron  
 “ performed miracles in Egypt, and who  
 “ spake by Moses, the patriarchs, pro-  
 “ phets, and apostles †.” “ The Spirit,” says Cyril of Jerusalem, “ operates in the  
 “ law and the prophets ‡.

\* Unus enim et idem spiritus Dei, qui in prophetis quidem præconavit, quis et qualis esset adventus domini, in senioribus autem interpretatus est bene quæ bene prophetata fuerant; ipse et in apostolis annunciavit, plenitudinem temporum adoptionis venisse, et proximasse regnum cælorum, et inhabitare intra homines credentes in eum, qui ex virgine natus est Emmanuel. Lib. 3. cap. 25. p. 256.

† Ille est, in quo Moyse et Aaron coram Pharaone rege Ægypti signa fecerunt, et de quo magi dixerunt: Hic digitus Dei est. Ille est, qui in Moyse et in omnibus sanctis patriarchis et prophetis atque apostolis locutus est. In Symbol. cap. 6. Opera, vol. 4. p. 91.

‡ Το εν νομω κ' προφηταις ενεργησαν. Cat. 4. Opera, p. 55.

Hippolytus

Hippolytus says that “ the Fathers were  
 “ inspired by the Spirit, and also honoured  
 “ by the logos itself, being united to them  
 “ as an instrument, having the logos always  
 “ in them, as a *plectrum*, by which being  
 “ moved, the prophets declared whatever  
 “ God chose\*.”

With respect to the Father and the Son,  
 personally considered, it does not appear that  
 any particular province, or agency, was  
 assigned to the Spirit, except the mere  
*proceeding* from one or both of them, till  
 Synesius called him the “ center of the Fa-  
 “ ther and the Son †;” and M. Victorinus  
 called him “ the *copula*<sup>ξ</sup> of the Father and  
 “ the Son ‡.” But what they meant by  
 these expressions is best known to them-  
 selves.

\* Ουτοι γαρ πνευματι προφητικω οι πατερες κατηρητισμενοι, κ' υπ'  
 αυτς τς λογς αξιως τετιμημενοι, οργανων δικην εαυτοις ηνωμενοι, εχοντες  
 εν εαυτοις αιει τον λογον ως πληκτρον, δι ε κινεζμενοι απηγγελον ταυτα,  
 απερ ηθελεν ο θεος, οι προφηται. De Antichristo, Opera, p. 5.

† Χαιροις δ ακραυτ'ωνοια

Κεντρον κορυ η παλρος. Hymn 5. Opera, p. 342

‡ Adesto sancte spiritus, patris et filii copula.

Tu cum quiescis pater es, cum procedis filius.

In unum qui cuncta necis, tu es spiritus sanctus. De  
 Trinitate Hymnus. Bib. Pat. vol. 5. p. 360.

It was necessary, however, that the Spirit should be no cypher in the system; and that, being a *person*, he should have the power of voluntary action. Accordingly, it is observed by Basil, that, “ though the Spirit be *sent*, according to the œconomy, he was no servant, but acted voluntarily \*.”

Creation is generally ascribed to the Son; but Basil maintains, that “ because it is said, by the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth, all things were created equally by the Son and the Spirit †.” In another place he adds a farther argument from Ps. cxix. 73. *Thy hands have made me and fashioned me.* He also says, that the supernatural body of Christ was the work of the Spirit ‡.

\* Αποστέλλεται μεν οικονομικῶς, ενεργεῖ δὲ αὐτεξουσίως. De Fide, Opera, vol. i. p. 432.

† Ἐπει ἐν λόγῳ<sup>Θ</sup> μεν κυριεὶς ὁ σωτὴρ, καὶ πνεῦμα τὸ σωματικὸν αὐτὸ το αἰγιον πνεῦμα, ἀμφοτέρω δὲ συνεργήσῃ τῇ κτίσει τῶν ὕψων, καὶ τῶν ἐν αἰσίοις δυνάμεων. διὰ τούτου εἰρηται τῷ λόγῳ κυριεὶς οἱ ὕψων ἐξερῶ-  
δησαν, καὶ τῷ πνεύματι τὸ σωματικὸν αὐτὸ πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις αὐτῶν. In Ps. 32. Opera, vol. i. p. 175.

‡ Ὅτι δημιουργοῦν τὸ πνεῦμα—Οἱ ὕψωνι διηγεῖται δοξάν θεα, ποιῶ-  
σιν δὲ χειρῶν αὐτῆς ἀναγγέλλει τὸ φερεῖν. καὶ ἐν εἰρῇ • καὶ τὰ ἐργα



“ That the Holy Spirit *can* create, is evident,” says Athanasius, or one who borrows his name, “ from the body of our Lord ; the angel saying, that holy thing which shall be born of thee is of the Holy Spirit\*.” “ When the logos came into the virgin, the Holy Spirit accompanied him, and the logos, by the Spirit, formed to himself a body†.” To this making by the Holy Spirit, the Arians having objected that Christ must be the Son of the Spirit, the orthodox speaker in the dialogue above mentioned admits, that “ Jesus was produced by the Holy Spirit ; but he says, it is a *making*, not a *generating* ‡.”

That the Spirit might be employed by the Father as well as the Son, was proved

τῶν χειρῶν σὺ εἰσιν οἱ ἔθρανοι—αἱ χεῖρες σὺ ἐπλάτταν με, καὶ ἐποίησαν με—εἰ τοίνυν τὸ ὑπερκόσμιον σῶμα χρίσῃ ἐκ πνεύματος ἐστὶν ἁγίου. Adv. Eunomium, lib. 5. Opera, vol. 3. p. 778.

\* Οἱ δὲ δυνάμει ἡλίσαι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, εἰδείχθη ἐκ τῆς κυριακῆς σωμάτων, τὰ ἀγγελικῆς εἰρηκότος· τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματος ἐστὶν ἁγίου. Con. Mac. Dial. 1. Opera, vol. 2. p. 174.

† Οὕτως καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον μαριαν ἐπιδημιεῖς τὰ λόγους συνηχέτω τὸ πνεῦμα. καὶ ὁ λόγος ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, ἐπλάττει καὶ ἡμοῦς ἐαυτὸν τὸ σῶμα. Ad Serapion, Opera, vol. 1. p. 207.

‡ Ἡ γενεσις εἶπεν, ἔχει ἡ γεννησις. Dial. 3. Athanasii, Opera, vol. 2. p. 233.

by things being said to be done by the finger of God. For *the finger of God*, they said, means the Spirit; as when Christ said, *If I by the finger of God cast out demons*. The two tables of stone, therefore, being said to be written by the finger of God, were thought to be engraved by the Spirit. This was the opinion of Ambrose, who proves it by shewing, that what is called the Spirit of God in one evangelist, is called the finger of God in another\*.

The Spirit is generally stiled the *vivifier*, as if Christ made only the outward forms of

\* Legem quoque ipsam per spiritum sanctum datam accepimus et scriptam. Dicit enim Moyses : et dedit dominus duas tabulas lapideas digito Dei scriptas. Digitum autem Dei spiritum sanctum dici, evangelia manifestant. Cum enim dominus dæmonem ejecisset, et accusaretur a Judæis, quod in Beelzebub principe dæmoniorum, dæmonia expelleret : secundum Lucam quidem respondisse perhibetur, quod si ego in digito Dei expello dæmonia ; secundum Matthæum vero, si autem ego in spiritu Dei ejicio dæmones. Unde manifestum est spiritum digitum Dei dici. De Sp. Opera, vol. 5. p. 523.

Iste est in quo Moyses et Aaron coram Pharaone rege Ægypti signa fecerunt, et de quo magi dixerunt : hic digitus Dei est. Iste est, qui in Moyse et in omnibus sanctis patriarchis et prophetis et apostolis locutus est. In Symb. Opera, vol. 4. p. 91.

things

things, whereas to give them *life and motion* was the province of the Spirit. This is said to have been expressed by the *Spirit moving upon the face of the waters*. But on this subject a ray of good sense beams upon us in Theodoret, who says, that “ this Spirit means the wind \*.” He seems, however, to have been singular in this opinion.

The vivifying even the body of Christ was thought by Basil to be the office of the Holy Spirit †. And Cyril of Jerusalem says, that “ the Holy Spirit was imparted “ to the humanity of Christ at his baptism ‡.” To this it might be said, that the proper divinity belonging to Christ

\* Τις δει το παναγιον πνευμα ζωγονον των υδατων την φυσιν, η διαγραφον την τε βαπτισματος χαριν. αληθεστερον μεντοι εκεινον ομαι τον λογον, οτι το πνευμα ενλαυδα τον αερα καλει. ειπων χαρ, οτι τον ερανον η την γην εποησε, η των υδατων δια της αευσσε μνησθεις, αναλκκιως η τε αερος εμνησθη, εκ της τε υδατος επιφανειας μεχρι τε ερανε δικηνης. αερος γαρ φυσιν, το τοις κλιω κειμενοις επιφερεσθαι σωματι.  
In Gen. Opera, vol. 1. p. 8.

† Το δε πνευμα — αγιαζον την κλισιν, η ζωποειν, η χρισμα εφ’ ημιν εν, ηδη δε η εν αυη τε κυρις σαρι. Hom. 17. Opera, vol. 1. p. 439.

‡ Εδει γαρ, ως εξηγησαντο τινες τας απαρχας, η τα προλεια τε αγια πνευματος των βαπτιζομενων τη ανθρωποηη τη σωτηρος παρασχειν, τε την τοιαυτην διδουλος χαριν. Cat. 17. Opera, p. 244.

himself might have sufficed. But Chrysostom says, “ When God, the *logos*, took  
 “ flesh of us, he fashioned it according to  
 “ the form of man, or one of the prophets,  
 “ or as one of the apostles ; receiving the  
 “ Holy Spirit ; not that the divinity of  
 “ the Son was not sufficient, but that the  
 “ perfect knowledge of the trinity might  
 “ be shewn in that creation.” i. e. the flesh  
 of Christ \*.

Austin doubted whether it was right to call the Holy Spirit the *goodness* of the Father, and of the Son ; but he had less scruple to say that he was the *sanctity* of them both †. This, however, could not respect

\* Οταν δε αναλαβη ο θεος λογος την σαρκια την εξ ημων ποιει αυτην κατὰ τον ανθρωπινον τυπον, ως ενα των προφητων, η ως ενα των αποστολων, δεχομενην πνευμα αγιον. ειπον προλαβων, ην ως μη αρκεισης της θεότητος τς υις, αλλ' ινα ενίελης της τριότητος η γνωσις εν τω πλασματι τρώδει. De Sp. S. Opera, vol. 6. p. 213.

† Utrum autem boni patris, et boni filii, spiritus sanctus, quia communis ambobus est, recte *bonitas* dici potest amborum, non audeo temerariam precipitare sententiam ; veruntamen ambobus cum dicere *sanctitatem* facilius ausus fuero, non amborum quasi qualitatem, sed ipsum quoque substantiam, et tertiam in trinitate personam. De Civitate Dei, lib. 11. cap. 23. Opera, vol. 5. p. 639.

the

the humanity of Christ, because the Father had no human nature. This might be construed to imply, that he thought the Spirit to be a *property* only, and not a *person*, if he had not been well known to hold the Holy Spirit to be the third person in the trinity.

Still more has the language of Cyril of Alexandria the appearance of his supposing that the Holy Spirit was only a property, or some divine grace, when he says, “The *peace* which our Lord gave his disciples *was the Holy Spirit* \*.” With equal impropriety Gregory Nyssen says, that “the *glory* which Christ had with the Father *before the world was*, meant the Holy Spirit. For then,” he says, “nothing existed but the Father, the Son, and the Spirit; and that persons so distinct could not be united, but by the participation of the same Spirit †.” This, if it had

\* Pax ergo quæ principatus—excedit, Christi spiritus est, in quo Deo patri universa filius reconciliavit. In John. lib. 10. cap. 7. Opera, vol. 1. p. 936.

† Δύξαν γὰρ ἐνλαυδα λέγειν αὐτὸν οἶμαι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὃ ἐδώκεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς διὰ τὴ προσφύσημάτος. ἔ γὰρ εἰν ἄλλως ἐνωθῆναι τὰς ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων διεστηκότας, μὴ τῇ ἐνοσῆτι τὴ πνευμάτος συμψυόμενας. In Cor. xv. 28. Opera, vol. 1. p. 849.

not been equally dark itself, might have thrown some light on the Spirit being called the *copula* of the Father and the Son, quoted above.

This uncertain distribution of offices not giving satisfaction to Ambrose and Austin, it was determined by them, that all the three persons in the trinity always act jointly in all their respective operations. Indeed, Eusebius had said that “the Father, Son, and Spirit, are all principles (*αρχαι*) \*.” Also, that they were each *capable* of the functions of the others had been allowed; but it had been said that they *chose* to confine themselves to certain operations. “Christ,” says Cyril of Jerusalem, “made angels and archangels, thrones and dominions; not that the Father wanted a creative power, but that he chose that the Son should reign over the works of his own hands, and gave him the government of the things which he had made†.”

\* Οι δε γε θεοι λογοι, την αγιαν κ̅ μακαριαν τριαδα, πα̅ρος κ̅ υ̅ις, κ̅ αγι̅ς πνευματος, εν αρχης λογω̅ τα̅τεσι. Præparatio, lib. II. cap. 19. p. 541.

† Παν̅τα επο̅ισεν ο̅ χ̅ριστος και̅ α̅γγελ̅ς λε̅γης, και̅ αρχ̅α̅γγ̅ελ̅ς, και̅ κυ̅ρι̅ο̅τή̅τας, και̅ θ̅ρον̅ες. ε̅χ̅ ο̅τι ο̅ πα̅τερ̅ς η̅λον̅ει̅ πε̅ρι̅ την̅ των̅ δημιουργ̅η̅μα̅των

“ The Father,” says Basil, “ had no need of  
 “ the Son, though he operated by him ;  
 “ but he chose to do so ; nor does the Son  
 “ want assistance, when he operates like the  
 “ Father ; but he chose to perfect every  
 “ thing by the Spirit\*.” “ As the Fa-  
 “ ther,” says Theodoret, “ could have  
 “ created without the Son, but did it not,  
 “ to shew the identity of his nature ; so the  
 “ Son could have sanctified man with-  
 “ out the Spirit, but did it with the Spirit,  
 “ that what was done might be the work  
 “ of the Father, Son, and Spirit†.”

As if an *equal capacity* for every thing  
 had not been a sufficient argument of *equal*

μάτων ἀνίσργιαν . ἀλλ’ οἱ βασιλευεῖν τῶν ὑπ’ αὐτὰ πεποιημένων τὸν υἱὸν  
 ἠβέλγη, αὐτὸς αὐτῷ παρέχων τῶν καίσαρκευαζόμενων τὴν ὑψηλήσιν  
 Cat. 11. Opera, p. 146.

\* Οὕτω γὰρ ἂν εἶε πάσης προσδεῖσθαι υἱοῦ, μόνῳ τῷ θελεῖν δη-  
 μιουργῶν, ἀλλ’ ὁμῶς θελεῖ καὶ πεφυκε διὰ υἱᾶς . εἴτ’ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς συνεργίας  
 προσδεῖσθαι, καὶ ὁμοιότητά τε πατρὸς ἐνεργῶν . ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς θελεῖ  
 καὶ πεφυκε διὰ τῆς πνευματικῆς τελείας . De Sp. S. cap. 16. Opera,  
 vol. 2. p. 325.

† Ὡςπερ ὁ πατήρ, δυναμένῳ κτισαὶ τὸν ἀνθρώπον, μέγα τὰ υἱᾶς  
 κλιζει, ἵνα δείχῃ τὸ ταύτον τῆς φύσεως· εἰς καὶ ὁ υἱὸς, δυναμένῳ κτισαὶ  
 αἰὶνον τὸν ἀνθρώπον, μέγα τὰ πνευματικῶν ἀγίων κλιζει, ἵνα δείχῃ τὸ  
 γεγονῶς ἔργον πατρὸς, καὶ υἱᾶς, καὶ ἁγίων πνευματικῶν . Dial. Adv.  
 Macedonian, Opera, vol. 5. p. 343.

power, the three persons were represented as all actually bearing a part in every operation. A treatise ascribed to Athanasius is the first in which I have found this sentiment, as applied to the body of Christ. “How,” says the Macedonian, “does Solomon say *wisdom has builded herself a house*?” Orthodox. “Because all the works of the Father are also those of the Son, and of the Spirit; and, therefore, it is sometimes said to be the Father’s, sometimes the Son’s, and sometimes the Holy Spirit’s\*.”

But it is in Ambrose, as I have observed, that this system of *joint operation* appears most complete. “The holy and undivided trinity,” he says, “never does any thing separately.” He instances in the incarnation, the voice from heaven, at the baptism of Christ, &c.† “What one

\* Πως ειπεν ο Σολομων, Η Σοφια οικοδομησεν εαυτη οικον; ΟΡΘ. Τελο γαρ εστιν ο λεγων, οτι παντα τα εργα τε πατρος, κη τε υιου, κη τε αγιου πνευματος εστι. κη δια τελο πως τε πατρος λεγεται, πως τε υιου, πως τε αγιου πνευματος. Opera, vol. 2. p. 233.

† Quia sancta et inseparabilis trinitas numquam aliquid extra se singillatim operari noverit. In Symb. Opera, vol. 4. p. 93.

“ speaks



“ speaks, they all speak ; for there is one  
 “ voice of the trinity\*.” “ The Father,  
 “ Son, and Spirit, created the body of  
 “ Christ ; the Father, because it is said  
 “ *God sent his Son made of a woman ; the*  
 “ *Son because it is said wisdom has builded*  
 “ *her a house ; and the Spirit because Mary*  
 “ *was with child by the Spirit†.*” He  
 represents all the persons as present at  
 the baptism of Jesus, “ the Spirit under a  
 “ corporeal form, and the Father, because  
 “ he could not be seen, was heard‡.”

Austin, who generally followed the steps  
 of his master Ambrose in other things, did

\* Quod unus loquitur, tres loquuntur, quia vox una  
 est trinitatis. In Luc. lib. 10. Opera, vol. 2. p. 203.

† Et etenim sicut legimus quia creavit pater dominicæ  
 incarnationis sacramentum, creavit et spiritus: ita etiam  
 legimus quod et ipse Christus suum corpus creavit. Creavit  
 enim pater, secundum quod scriptum est: dominus creavit  
 me—et alibi: misit Deus filium suum factum ex muliere  
 factum sub lege. Creavit et spiritus illud omne mysterium,  
 secundum quod legimus ; quia inventa est Maria in utero  
 habens ex spiritu sancto. De Sp. S. lib. 2. cap. 8. Opera,  
 vol. 4. p. 241.

‡ Videmus spiritum, sed specie corporali: videamus et  
 patrem ; sed qui videre non possumus, audiamus. In  
 Luc. cap. 3. Opera, vol. 2. p. 41.

it in this. He says, in general, that “ in  
 “ whatever the trinity acts, it operates in-  
 “ separably, because there is one operation  
 “ of the trinity, as it is one substance,  
 “ essence, and will\*.” “ The whole tri-  
 “ nity,” he says, “ reconciled us to itself, as  
 “ the whole trinity made the word flesh†.”  
 He says that “ the appearances of God in  
 “ the Old Testament, might be of God  
 “ in general, or of the whole trinity, or of  
 “ the Father, Son, or Spirit, according to  
 “ the circumstances of the passage‡.” “ The  
 “ voice from heaven, *I have glorified it, and*  
 “ *will glorify it again*, was from the whole

\* Quicquid operatur trinitas sancta inseparabiliter hæc eadem operatur, quia una est trinitatis operatio sicut una est substantia essentia et voluntas. *Questiunculæ ex libris de Trinitate, Opera, vol. 3. p. 1038.*

† Trinitas enim nos sibi reconciliavit, per hoc quod solum verbum carnem ipsa trinitas fecit. *De Fid. cap. 2. Opera, vol. 3. p. 217.*

‡ Tam enim quæsitum atque tractatum est, in illis antiquis corporibus formis et visis, non tantummodo patrem, nec tantummodo filium, nec tantummodo spiritum sanctum apparuisse sed aut indifferenter dominum deum qui trinitas ipsa intelligitur aut quamlibet ex trinitate personam, quam lectionis textus indiciiis circumstantibus significaret. *De Trinitate, lib. 3. cap. 1. Opera, vol. 3. p. 281.*

“ trinity.”

“trinity\*.” He says that he was the first who taught that doctrine.

This doctrine of the joint operation of all the persons in the trinity, though most conspicuous in Ambrose and Austin, is not peculiar to them. It appears in Epiphanius and Basil. “All works,” says the former, “are the joint production of the Father, “Son, and Spirit †.” “In every operation,” says Basil, “the Holy Spirit co-“operates with the Father and the Son ‡.” We find the same in Theophylact, who

\* Omnes quos legere potui qui ante me scripserunt de trinitate, quæ est Deus, divinorum librorum veterum et novorum catholici tractatores, hoc intenderunt secundum scripturas docere, quod pater et filius et spiritus sanctus, unius ejusdemque substantiæ inseparabili æqualitate divinum insinuent unitatem.—Nec eandem trinitatem dixisse de cælo: Tu es filius meus: sive cum baptizatus est a Johanne, sive in montem quum cum illo erant tres discipuli: aut quem sonuit vox, dicens: et clarificavi et iterum clarificabo: sed tantummodo patris vocem fuisse ad filium factum quamvis pater et filius et spiritus sanctus, sicut inseparabiles sunt. Ibid. lib. 1. cap. 4. p. 242.

† Πάντα γὰρ τὰ ἔργα οὗτα εἰναι, ἀμὰ ἐκ πατρὸς, καὶ υἱὸς καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος γεγενῆσθαι. Hær. 71. Opera, vol. 1. p. 832.

‡ Οὕτω δὲ ἂν το συνάφες καὶ ἀδιαίρετον καὶ πᾶσαν ἐνεργειαν ἀπὸ πατρὸς καὶ υἱὸς τε ἁγίου πνεύματος διδάχθῃς. De Sp. S. cap. 16. Opera, vol. 2. p. 324.

says,

says, “ Where there is one person of the  
“ holy trinity, there are all\*.”

Idacius Clarus shews at large, that “ all the  
“ attributes of the Father, Son, and Spirit,  
“ are common ; as those of God, Lord, holy,  
“ prince, king, judge, true, just, strong.  
“ They are all judges, they all operate, they  
“ are all lofty. They have in common, the  
“ appellations of fire, light, good, great,  
“ virtue, fountain, river, &c.” and thus he  
proceeds to near an hundred instances †.

Cyril of Alexandria proves this doctrine  
from our Saviour’s saying that *he could do  
nothing without the Father* ; meaning, he  
says, that “ he was consubstantial with  
“ him ; having equal power, the same will,  
“ and the same co-operation ‡.”

\* *Ενθα γαρ μια υποστάσις της αγίας τριάδος, εκεί ἔχαι λοιπαι.*  
In Rom. cap. 8. Opera, vol. 2. p. 75.

† Bib. Pat. vol. 5. p. 419.

‡ Non potest enim filius facere a seipso quid, nisi accipiat posse a patre. Quoniam autem æqualis operis et roboris se esse novit, ostendit quod unam ac eandem habeat cum ipso patre substantiam, et ipse adoptat per se ad faciendam, una volitione ad quodlibet simul vadens cum genitore, et ad idem opes consilium in omnibus, communibus quibusdam divinitatis legibus, simul concedens. De Trinitate, lib. 6. Opera, vol. 2. p. 464.

## SECTION IV.

*Of the Arguments for the Divinity of the Holy Spirit.*

THE reasoning of the Fathers concerning the divinity of the Holy Spirit lies in a much smaller compass than that concerning the divinity of the Son. One principal reason of this is, that so little mention is made of the Holy Spirit in the scriptures, and still less that can possibly be construed into an evidence of his being a divine person. This is a circumstance that could not escape notice, and which required to be accounted for by the orthodox. Among others, Epiphanius has advanced a reason which is curious enough. It goes upon the idea of the Holy Spirit being that person of the three which immediately dictated the scriptures. He says, that “the Holy Spirit says little concerning himself, that he might not commend himself; the scriptures being written to  
“ give

“give us examples\*.” I imagine, however, that the good Father would not have been sorry if the Holy Spirit had been less observant of this punctilio; as it would have made the defence of their favourite doctrine of the trinity much easier than, in the present state of things, they found it to be. For it was constantly observed by their adversaries, that the Holy Spirit is never once called God in all the New Testament.

Antiquity, also, and the established forms of public worship, were, in that age, strongly urged against the novel doctrine of the divinity of the Spirit. Basil particularly complains of his having been pressed by this argument, though he endeavours to defend himself, saying, that the authority of Gregory Thaumaturgus, his predecessor in the see of Neocæsarea, and whose memory was almost idolized in that country, was not against him, as his adversaries pretended.

† Και να μη τις ειπη, ουκ εν εστι το πνευμα, επειδη περι ενος κ̅ ενος διηγεται; ουκ εδει το πνευμα αντισταλον αυτο γενεσθαι εαυτο. αι γαρ φυλαττειται η δεια γραφη υπογραμμος ημιν γινεσθαι. Hær. 53. Opera, vol. I. p. 475. 485.

He likewise urges the authority of Firmilian \*. But of this the people must have been as good judges as the bishop.

We have happily preserved to us the established forms of prayer and benediction in the writings of Justin Martyr, who, in his account of the administration of the Lord's supper, says, that the minister “ offers praise and glory to the Father of all, “ in the name of the Son, and of the Holy “ Spirit †.” Again, he says, “ For every “ thing that we eat we give thanks to the “ maker of all things, by his Son Jesus “ Christ, and by the Holy Spirit ‡.”

Moreover, in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, composed, probably, in the fourth century,

\* Εν τοις των Γρηγορις, κὶ ο νυν ἀντιλεγόμενος τρόπος της δοξολογίας εἰν, εκ της εκείνης παραδόσεως τη ἐκκλησίᾳ πεφυλαγμένος. κὶ ὁ πολὺς ο πόνος μικρὸν κινήσει τὴν ἐπε τούτοις πληροφορίαν λαβεῖν. ταύτην κὶ Φίρμιλιανὼ τῷ ἡμετέρῳ μαρτυρεῖ τὴν πιστὴν οἱ λόγοις καλεῖται. De Spiritu Sancto, cap. 29. Opera, vol. 2. p. 360.

† Καὶ ὥς λαβὼν, αἶνον κὶ δόξαν τῷ πατρί των ὁλων, δια τὸ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ, κὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, ἀναπέμπει. Apol. 1 p. 96.

‡ Ἐπὶ πασι δὲ οἷς προσφερομεθα εὐλογεῖμεν τὸν ποιητὴν των παντων, δια τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κὶ δια πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου. Ibid. p. 97.

according

according to what was supposed to have been the practice of the earliest ages, it is said, that “ God alone is to be worshipped “ by Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Spirit\*.”

With respect to the argument from the scriptures, Basil contents himself with saying, that “ many things were received on “ the authority of apostolical tradition, and “ that there was no more reason to reject “ this than those\*.”

As the *personality* of the Spirit was very much questioned, Epiphanius says, that “ he assumed the form of a dove, at the “ baptism of our Saviour, on purpose to “ show that he had a real person†.” It

† Οὖν παντοκράτορα εἷνα μοιον ὑπαρχεῖν, παρ ὃν ἄλλος οὐκ ἐστὶ· καὶ αὐτὸν μόνον σεβεῖν καὶ προσκυνεῖν, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, ἐν τῷ παναγίῳ πνεύματι. Lib. 6. cap. 14. P. 343.

\* Πρὸς γὰρ μὴν τοῦ ἀμαρτυροῦ καὶ ἀγγραφῶν εἶναι τὴν, συν τῷ πνεύματι, δοξολογίαν, ἐκεῖνο λεγόμενον. ὅτι εἰ μὲν μηδὲν ἑτέρον ἀγγραφῶν, μηδὲ τὸ τοῦ παραδεχθῆτα· εἰ δὲ τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν μουσικῶν ἀγγραφῶς ἡμῖν ἐμπολιτεύεται, μετὰ πολλῶν ἑτέρων καὶ τὸ τοῦ καταδεξόμεθα. De Sp. S. cap, 23. vol. 2. P. 357.

† Διὰ τὸ καίπερ αὐτὸς τὸ πνευμάτιον τὰ ἁγία σῶμα μὴ φορεσάμενος, ἐν εἰδεί περιετραπὴν σχηματοποιεῖται, ὅπως δείξῃ σε καὶ ἐλεγχῇ σε τὴν πλάνην, ὅτι ἐνυποστάτων ἐστὶ τὸ πνεῦμα καθ' ἑαυτὸ, καὶ ἐνυποστάτος ὁ πατήρ, καὶ ἐνυποστάτος ὁ μονογενὴς. Hær. 62. Opera, vol. 1. p. 517.



was acknowledged, however, by Austin and others, that the Holy Spirit assumed the form of a dove on this occasion, as well as of *fire* on the day of Pentecost, for a time only, and not permanently, as Christ did his body \*. It should seem, therefore, that this could not be a proof of *permanent* personality.

As Athanasius was the great asserter of the divinity of the Spirit, and of his being consubstantial with the Father, the reader will be desirous of seeing some of *his* arguments, and the following are a specimen of them. “The Spirit,” he says, “must  
“ be consubstantial with the Father and the  
“ Son, because, according to Paul, the Spirit of God searches all things, even the  
“ deep things of God †.” “Their folly is  
“ to be wondered at, who, not admitting

\* Non enim sicut filius hominem assumpsit, ut sic in æternum permaneat, sic spiritus sanctus columbam vel ignem : sed factæ sunt illæ visiones de creatura inferiore, ad manifestandum spiritum sanctum quæ esse postea destiterunt. Quest. 65. Opera, vol. 4. p. 679.

† Δειπνέειν λοιπόν ομοούσιον ομολογείσθαι υπό σε το αγιον πνευμα πατρι κ̅ υιω . παντα γαρ τα τε δεξ κ̅ τα βαδη επιταλαι το πνευμα το αγιον . Disp. Con. Ar. Opera, vol. 1. p. 144.

“ the Son of God to be a creature, in this  
 “ thinking very justly, yet think the Spi-  
 “ rit of the Son to be a creature\*.”—  
 “ This,” says he, “ is admitting a duality,  
 “ not a trinity†.” Basil also calls the  
 Holy Spirit the Spirit of Christ‡.

The capital argument for the divinity of the Spirit is, that the same things are ascribed to him as to God. This is urged by Epiphanius, who says, “ The Holy  
 “ Spirit is God, because he does the same  
 “ things that the Son does. Thus Christ  
 “ is sent by the Father, and the Spirit is  
 “ also sent; Christ speaks in the saints,  
 “ and the Spirit also speaks in them; Christ  
 “ baptizes, and the Spirit baptizes, &c.§”

One standing argument against the divinity of the Spirit, and a proof of his being a mere servant of the Father, and even of the Son, is his being said to be *sent* by

\* Τέλων γὰρ ἢ δαυμάσειεν ἂν τις τὴν ἀνομίαν, ὅτι τοῦ υἱοῦ τὰ δεξιὰ  
 δεξιὰς εἶναι κλησθῆναι, καὶ καλῶς γε τέλει φρονεῖν, πῶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὰ υἱοῦ  
 κλησθῆναι καὶ ἀκρῶς πνεύσῃ. Epist. Ad Serapion, Opera, vol.  
 I. p. 174. 196.

† Ἡ γὰρ ἑστὶς ἐστὶν ἀλλὰ δύο.\* Ibid. p. 175.

‡ Πνεῦμα ἢ χριστὸν τοῦ κυρίου εἶναι. Hom. 27. Opera, vol. I.  
 p. 523.

§ Ibid. 24. Opera, vol. I. p. 523.

them.

them. But to this argument Ambrose says, “ The Son is sometimes said to be  
 “ sent by the Spirit, as, The Spirit of the  
 “ Lord is upon me, because he has sent  
 “ me to preach the gospel to the poor, &c.\*”

In John iv. 24. it is said, *God is a spirit*; but Ambrose read it, *the Spirit is God*; and he says, that this text so clearly proves the divinity of the Spirit, that the Arians erase it out of their books†. I do not find, however, that any other writer mentions this circumstance. To advance the dignity of the Spirit, Job, the monk, says, “ that the  
 “ holy scriptures call the whole trinity by  
 “ his name, in saying, *God is a spirit*‡.”

\* Ita et filium Dei spiritus misit. Dicit enim filius Dei, spiritus domini super me, propter quod unxit me prædicare captivis remissionem, et cæcis visum. De Sp. S. lib. 3. Opera, vol. 4. p. 254.

† Quem locum ita expresse Ariani testificamini esse de spiritu, ut eum de vestris codicibus auferatis : atque utinam de vestris, et non etiam de ecclesiæ codicibus tolleretis.— Et fortasse hoc etiam in oriente fecistis. Et literas quidem potuistis abolere; sed fidem non potuistis auferre. De Spiritu Sancto, lib. 3. cap. 11. Opera, vol. 4. p. 271.

‡ Και το αξιωµα δε τς πνευµατος η ιερα επαιρσσαι γραφη, ολην την τριαδα τη τς πνευµατος εξονοµαζει φωνη, ως το πνευµα ο θεος.  
 Phot. Bib. sect. 222. p. 623.

The arguments for the *procession* of the Spirit, either from the Father or the Son, or from both, lie in a small compass. For the whole depends upon his being said to be *sent* by either, or by both of them. Besides this, Austin says, that “our Saviour’s  
 “imparting the Holy Spirit by breathing  
 “on his apostles, is a proof that the Spirit  
 “proceeds from him, as well as from the  
 “Father\*.”

It is remarkable, that the doctrine of the divinity of the Spirit was attacked with even more vigour than that of the divinity of Christ; the reason of which was that, besides the unitarians, the Arians joined in this attack; and being very numerous at the time of that controversy, and having sometimes the favour of the emperors, they spoke and wrote with great freedom.

We know less of the history of Macedonius, who was at the head of the opposition

\* Neque enim flatus ille corporeus, cum sensu corporaliter tangendi procedens ex corpore, substantia spiritus sancti fuit, sed demonstratio per congruam significationem, non tantum a patre, sed et a filio procedere spiritum sanctum. De Trinitate, lib. 4. cap. 20. vol. 3. p. 313.

to the doctrine of the divinity of the Spirit, than of that of Arius, or almost any other leader of a sect. He is said not to have denied the personality of the Spirit; for Sozomen says, that “ he held the Spirit to  
 “ be a person, but like one of the angels,  
 “ subservient to the Father and the Son,  
 “ whom he allowed to be consubstantial  
 “ with each other \*.” The same is asserted by Nicéphorus†. It appears from Athanasius‡, that they who held this opinion were also called *Tropici*‡. That Macedonius, and his proper followers, did not deny the divinity of Christ, is evident from what Chrysostom says, with some degree of pleafantry. “ The Arians suffering ship-  
 “ wreck, lost both the glory of Christ, and  
 “ the power of the Holy Spirit: the Ma-

\* Το δε αγιον πνευμα, αμοιρον των αυλων πρεσβειων απεφαινελο, διακονον η υπηρετην καλων, η οσα περι των θειων αγγελων λεγων τις.  
 Lib. 4. cap. 27. p. 173.

† Διακονον γαρ αυτο ειναι η υπεργον εισηγειτο, η βραχυ τι τω αγγελικων διαφερον ταγματων. Lib. 9. cap. 47. vol. 1. p. 800.

‡ Οι δε τροπικοι, το πνευμα η αυτοι, τοις κτισμασι συναριθμουν.  
 Epist. Ad Serapion, Opera, vol. 1. p. 192.



judges, and not of learners\*.” In another place, he complains of persons “teazing  
“him with questions about the Holy Spirit,  
“not with any view to information, but  
“that if his answers should not please  
“them, they might have a handle to make  
“war against him†.”

He speaks of the zeal of his opponents in the strongest terms. “They would  
“sooner,” he says, “cut out their tongues  
“than say *Glory to the Holy Spirit*. This  
“is the cause of the most violent, and irre-  
“concilable war with us. They say that  
“glory is to be given to God *in* the Holy  
“Spirit, not *to* the Holy Spirit; and they  
“obstinately adhere to this language con-  
“cerning the Spirit, as expressing a low  
“opinion of him‡.” “When I was lately  
“praying before the people, and sometimes

\* Επειδη δε περιστηναι ημεις, δικαιοματι μαλλον η μαχηται, ημεις δοκιμασται βελομενοι, ην αυλοι τι λαβειν επιζητητες. Hom. 27. Opera, vol. 1. p. 523. 526.

† Αλλ’ οπως εαν μη συμβαινεντας τη εαυτων επιθυμια και αποκρι- σεις ευρωσι, ταυτην αφορμην δικαιαν εχειν δοξωσι τε πολεμους. De Sp. S. Opera, vol. 2. p. 292.

‡ Αλλα τας γλωσσας αν προουσις μαλλον η την φωνην ταυτην δεξ- αντο. τειο μεν εν εστιν, ο τον ακηρυσινον ημιν η ασπενδον πολεμον

“ concluding with the doxology to the Fa-  
 “ ther, with the Son and Holy Spirit, and  
 “ sometimes through the Son in the Holy  
 “ Spirit, some who were present said, that  
 “ I used phrases which were not only new,  
 “ but contradictory \*.” He says that “ he  
 “ was accused of novelty, and as an inventor  
 “ of new phrases, and that they spared no  
 “ kind of reproach, because he made the  
 “ Son equal to the Father, and did not se-  
 “ parate the Holy Spirit from the Son †; on  
 “ which account, he says, he applied to  
 “ himself our Saviour’s saying *blessed are ye*  
 “ *when men reproach you, &c. ‡*” And speak-

επεχειρει. εν τω πνευμαλι, φησι, τω αγιω την δοξολογιαν αποδοσεν τω  
 θεω, εχι δε κ̅ τω πνευμαλι, κ̅ εκδυμιαζια της φωτης ταυτης ως ταπει-  
 νης, τε πνευματος περιεχουσαι. De Sp.S. vol. 2. cap. 25. p. 347.

\* Προσευχμενω μοι παρων μελα τε λαχ, κ̅ αμφοτερας την δοξολο-  
 γιαν αποπληρηνη τω θεω κ̅ πατρι, νυν μεν μελα τε υις συν τω πνευμαλι  
 τω αγιω, νυν δε δια τε υις εν αγιω πνευμαλι, επεσηκησαν τινες, των  
 παρων, ξενηεσαις ημ̅ς φωναις κεχρησθαι λεγουσες, κ̅ αμα προς  
 αλληλας υπεναντιως εχασαις. Ibid. p. 293.

† Οτι μελα πατρος αποπληρημεν τω μονογενει την δοξολογιαν, κ̅  
 το αγιον πνευμα μη διτωμεν απο τε υις. οθεν νεωτεροισις ημας κ̅  
 καινοις κ̅ εφευρεσις ρηματα, κ̅ τι γαρ εχι των επονειδιστων αποκα-  
 λεσιν. Ibid. cap. 6. p. 301. 304.

‡ Ων τοσδιον απεχω δυσχεραυνει ταις λοιδορ̅αις, ωσε ει μη λυπην  
 ημ̅ν ενεποιει κ̅ αδισλειπ̅ιν οδυνην η κατ̅ αυ̅ις ζημια, μικρο αν ειπου  
 κ̅ χαριν,



ing of his own resolution, he says, “ we  
 “ must obey God rather than man \*.”  
 These circumstances clearly show that the  
 great mass of the people exceedingly dis-  
 liked the doctrine for which Basil con-  
 tended. The same state of things appears  
 also from the writings of Gregory Nazian-  
 zen, who says, “ the heretics say, whoever  
 “ worshipped the Spirit, either of the an-  
 “ cients or moderns †.”

If what Jerom and others say ‡, be true,  
 that “ Donatus agreed with the Arians,  
 “ with respect to the Holy Spirit,” it will  
 be an argument of some weight in favour

ὡς χάριν αὐτοῖς τῆς βλασφημίας εἶναι, ὡς μακαρισμὸς προξένους. μα-  
 καριοὶ γὰρ ἐτε, φησιν, εἰαν ονειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς [ὡς διώξωσι καὶ εἰπωσι  
 πάντων πονηρὸν ῥῆμα κατὰ ἡμῶν ψευδομένοι] ἐνεκεν ἡμῶν. — Ἐπὶ τοῖς  
 το πολέμικον τῆλο κατὰ ἡμῶν συγκεκινῆται τῖφος· πᾶσαι δὲ πόλεις, καὶ  
 κώμαι καὶ ἐσχαλῖαι, πᾶσαι πληρεῖς τῶν ἡμετέρων διαβολῶν. Cap. 26.  
 Opera, vol. 2. p. 361.

\* Πρὸς ἕς δίκαιον τὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων φωνὴν ἀποκηρυχθῆναι, οἱ πειθαρχ-  
 χεῖν θεῷ δεῖ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀνθρώποις. Ibid. p. 313.

† Ἀλλὰ τίς προσεκύνησε τῷ πνεύματι, φησὶ· τίς ἦν τῶν παλαιῶν,  
 ἢ τῶν νεῶν. Or. 37. Opera, p. 599.

‡ Extant ejus multa, ad suam hæresim pertinentia, et  
 de spiritu sancto liber, Ariano dogmati congruens. Cata-  
 logus scriptorum, Opera, vol. 1. p. 311.

of

of the novelty of the orthodox opinion. For the Donatists were not distinguished from other christians, with respect to the divinity of Christ.

One kind of argument used by the Macedonians, seems to have gravelled the orthodox exceedingly ; as it affected the distinction between the Son and Spirit, which it has been seen they could never clearly make out ; I shall recite the objection as it is stated by Athanasius, Basil, and Didymus of Alexandria ; and it is of a nature to relieve the dryness of these discussions.

“ If the Spirit is not a creature, nor yet  
 “ one of the angels, but proceeds from the  
 “ Father, is he not also a son ; so that he  
 “ and the logos are brothers ; and if he be  
 “ a brother, how is the logos the only be-  
 “ gotten son ; and why are they not equal ?  
 “ But the Son is said to be begotten after  
 “ the Father, and the Spirit is after the  
 “ Son. If he be from the Father, why is  
 “ he not said to be begotten, so that he  
 “ is a Son, and not simply a Holy Spirit.  
 “ But

“ But if the Spirit is from the Son, is not  
 “ the Father the grandfather of the Holy  
 “ Spirit\*.”

“ The Holy Spirit, if he be God,” as  
 the objection is stated by Basil, “ must  
 “ either be begotten, or unbegotten. If he  
 “ be unbegotten, he is the Father; if be-  
 “ gotten, the Son; and if he is neither  
 “ begotten nor unbegotten, he is a crea-  
 “ ture†.” “ If the Holy Spirit is not  
 “ created,” as the objection is stated by  
 Didymus, “ he is either the brother of  
 “ God the Father, and the uncle of Jesus  
 “ Christ, or else he is the Son of Christ,  
 “ and the grandson of God the Father; or  
 “ he himself is the son of God, and then

\* Εἰ μὴ κτισμα ἐστὶ, μὴδὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἰς εἶναι, ἀλλ’ ἐκ τῶ πατρὸς  
 ἐκπορεύεται, ὅθεν υἱὸς ἐστὶ καὶ αὐτοῦ. καὶ δύο ἀδελφοὶ εἰσιν αὐτοῦ τε καὶ ὁ  
 λόγος. καὶ εἰ ἀδελφὸς ἐστὶ, πῶς μονογενὴς ὁ λόγος, ἢ πῶς ἕκαστοι, ἀλλ’ ὁ  
 μὴν, μέλει τὸν πατέρα γεγεννηταὶ το δὲ, μέλει τὸν υἱὸν ὀνομαζεῖται. πῶς  
 δὲ εἰ ἐκ τῶ πατρὸς ἐστὶν, καὶ λεγέται καὶ αὐτοῦ γεγεννησθῆναι. ἡ οὖν υἱὸς ἐστὶν  
 ἀλλ’ ἀπλῶς πνεῦμα ἁγίον. εἰ δὲ τὸ υἱὸς ἐστὶ πνεῦμα, ὅθεν παππῶς ἐστὶν  
 ὁ πατὴρ τῶ πνευματίου. Epist. Ad. Serapion, Opera, vol. 1.  
 p. 189.

† Ἀγεννητὸν ἐστὶν ἢ γεννητὸν. εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἀγεννητὸν, πατὴρ. εἰ δὲ γεν-  
 νητὸν, υἱὸς. εἰ δὲ μὴδ’ ἐξερὸν τῶν, κτισμα. Hom. 27. Opera,  
 vol. 1. p. 524.

“ Jesus

“ Jesus Christ will not be the only begotten Son. These,” he says, “ were usual topics of argument \*.” As no satisfactory answers could ever be given by the orthodox to these questions, which are calculated to set their doctrine in a very ridiculous point of light, it is no wonder that so long a space of time, aided by the authority of councils and emperors was necessary to establish it.

One argument to prove that the Holy Spirit is a creature, was drawn from John i. 3. where it is said that *every thing was made by the logos, and without him nothing was made*. But to this Epiphanius answers, that the true reading was *without him nothing was made that was made by him*†. But

\* Idcirco illud quod solent tractare prætereo, sacrilega adversus nos audacia proclamantes. Si spiritus sanctus creatus non est, aut frater est Dei patris, aut patruus est unigeniti Jesu Christi: aut filius Christi est, aut nepos est Dei patris: aut ipse filius Dei est, et jam non erit unigenitus Jesus Chrillus, cum alterum fratrem habeat. De Sp. S. in Jerom's works, vol. 6. p. 234.

† Νομίζουσι δὲ παραγινωσκόντες, καὶ μὴ νοούντες διαστρέλλειν τὴν ἀναγνώσιν τινες ἐν τῷ εἰπεῖν πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγενέτο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγενέτο. ἕως ὥστε ἀπολλιδέντες τὸ ῥηθὲν, υποκόπαν βλασφημίας εἰς τὸ πνευ-

this, besides suggesting no meaning at all, appears to have no authority besides his own.

In this controversy great stress was laid on the force of some Greek particles ; as appears from Basil, “ As it is said, 1 Cor. “ viii. 6. there is one God, the Father, of “ whom (ἐξ ὧ) are all things, and one Lord “ Jesus Christ, by whom (δι’ οὗ) are all things, “ and one Holy Spirit, in whom (ἐν ᾧ) are all “ things, they (i. e. the heterodox) say that “ the δι’ οὗ, and ἐν ᾧ, are proofs of a different “ nature ; and therefore, that the Son was ἀνομοιος (unlike) to the Father\*.”

Considering the violence with which this controversy was conducted, it shews great moderation in Gregory Nazianzen, to ex-

μα το ἅγιον λαβόντες, σφαλλόνται περὶ τὴν ἀναγνώσιν καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς σφαλμάτος τῆς ἀναγνώσεως σκαζέσθιν εἰς βλασφημίαν τρεπομένοι. ἡ δὲ ἀναγνώσις εἰως ἔχει • πάντα δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲν, οὗ γεγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ • τούτεστι ὅτι εἰ τι γέγονε, δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο. An-  
coratus, sect. 75. Opera, vol. 2. p. 80.

\* Εἰς θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ εἰς κυρίος Ἰησοῦς χριστός, δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐν πνεύμα ἁγίῳ, ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα.—Ανομοιον δὲ τῷ ἐξ οὗ το δι’ οὗ, ἀνομοιος ἀρα καὶ τῷ πατρὶ ὁ υἱός. De Sp. S. Op. vol. 2. p. 294.

pref's

prefers himself so favourably concerning the Macedonians. For he says, “ We admire  
 “ their lives, but do not approve their  
 “ faith\*.” It is evident, that Basil thought proper to yield, in some measure, to the times, and the circumstances in which he found himself. That he might not exclude too great a number from communion, he advised that, without entering into nice distinctions, all those should be admitted who did not say that the Holy Spirit was a creature†.

\* *Ὁν τὸν βίον θαυμάζοντες, καὶ ἐπαινεῖμεν πάντῃ τὸν λόγον.*  
*Or. 44. Opera, p. 710.*

† *Ἐπει ἐν πολλῇ σομάτῃ ηὐνοικίᾳ κατὰ τὸ πνεύματος τε αἰνεῖ, καὶ πολλαγλώσσῃ ηὐκοινοῦνται εἰς τὴν μίαν αὐτὴ βλασφημίαν, αἰσχυόμεν, ὑμᾶς ὅσον εἰν ἐφ’ ἡμῖν εἰς ὀλίγον ἀριθμὸν περισῆσαι τὰς βλασφημίας, καὶ τὰς μὴ λεγόντας κτίσμα τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον δεχέσθαι εἰς καινότηαν.* *Ep. 203.*  
*Opera, vol. 3. p. 223.*

## CHAPTER X.

*Of the Doctrine of the Trinity after the Council of Nice.*

AFTER the council of Nice, we find a very different kind of orthodoxy from that which prevailed before. It was a maxim with the Antenicene writers, that the Son was inferior to the Father. They even expressed themselves, as has been seen, in the strongest manner upon this subject, and were solicitous so to do in order to remove the odium under which it is evident that the new doctrine of the *divinity of Christ* then lay. But as the christian world, and especially both the philosophical and the governing part of it, began to relish this doctrine (being one of which they were less ashamed, than of being the disciples of *a mere man*) the Platonic doctrine of Christ being the *logos of the Father* was pursued to its just extent ; and, accordingly, the Son was then pronounced to be

be of *the same substance with the Father*, and therefore *equal* to him in all respects.

At this, though nothing more than the natural consequence of the doctrine of Christ being the *logos* of the Father, many revolted ; and this circumstance, among others, contributed, no doubt, to the schism of the Arians ; who, firmly retaining the former doctrine of the inferiority of the Son to the Father, and yet seeing the impossibility of holding this with that of his being the proper *logos* of the Father, maintained that he was a *created logos*, or simply a super-angelic spirit, *created* (as was then the opinion) *out of nothing*, but still the maker of the world under God, as had been asserted of the former *logos*.

The alarm given by the new doctrine of the *perfect equality of the Son to the Father* was the greater, as, in the Sabellian controversy, it had been incautiously asserted, not only that Christ was inferior to the Father, but even of a *different substance* from him. For, as the learned unitarians had talked of the divinity in the Father and that in the Son being *the very same*, their  
opponents



opponents had maintained, that it was quite different; and this language had been uniformly held till the rise of the Arian controversy; so that those bishops who deposed Paul of Samosata, and those who were assembled at Nice, held, in fact, quite opposite doctrines; the one saying, that the Son was not *consubstantial* with the Father, and the other, that he was so. But at those different times they had different objects, and attended less to the propriety of their language, than to contradict their opponents.

Notwithstanding the prevalence of the new doctrine, we perceive several remains of the old, viz. that of the Father being the sole fountain of deity, which necessarily implied some kind of inferiority in the Son, both at the time of the Council of Nice, and afterwards. Indeed, that great principle (which strongly militates against the doctrine of the equality of the Son) was never properly given up at any period; and in words it is, I believe, in general, maintained by those who are called orthodox in the present age. “There is one God,” says

Athanasius, “because there is one Father\*.” Basil also says, “there are not two Gods, “because not two Fathers†.” And Cyril of Alexandria acknowledges, that “when “the scriptures speak of one God, that name “is to be applied to the Father only, with “whom the word was ‡.” But Pope Damasus, in the fourth century, anathematized those who said that the Father, exclusive of the Son and Spirit, was the one God §.

\* Εἰς θεός ὅτι καὶ πατήρ εἰς. *Contra Sabell. Opera*, vol. 1. p. 655, 656.

† Οὐ δύο θεοί, οὐδε γὰρ δύο πατέρες. *Hom 27. Opera*, vol. 1. p. 521.

‡ Quare quum unum Deum prædicare scripturam inveniamus, patri solum modo id nomen vere attribuiamus, apud quem erat verbum. In *John*, cap. 3. *Opera*, vol. 1. p. 603.

§ Ἡ παλιν ὑπεξέλομε ὅς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον αὐτὸ μόνον ὑπονοήσαι τὸν πατέρα θεὸν λεγέσθαι, καὶ μὴ πισυνέσθαι εἰς θεόν, ἀναθεμα εἶμι. *Theodoriti, Hist. lib. 5. cap. 11. p. 211.*

## SECTION I.

*The Doctrine of the perfect Equality of all the Persons in the Trinity.*

TO show how far the sentiments and language of the orthodox Fathers changed after the council of Nice, I shall produce passages from the most celebrated of them, in which they express their opinion with respect to the *perfect equality* of the Son to the Father, or that of all the three persons to each other.

Whereas it had been the universal language, from which no person thought himself at liberty to depart, to say that the Father was *the one true God*, it was now the custom to say, that the Trinity was the one God. This is the constant language of Austin. Speaking of the immensity of the divine nature, he says, “so is the Father, “so is the Son, so is the Holy Spirit, so is “the Trinity, one God\*.” Accordingly,

\* Ita pater, ita filius, ita spiritus sanctus, ita trinitas unus deus. Epist. 57. Opera, vol.2. p. 274.

in explaining the saying of our Saviour, *there is none good but one, that is God*, he says, “ It is not said, that there is none good but “ the *Father*, but there is none good but “ *God*. By the term *Father* is meant the “ *Father*, but by the term *God* is meant the “ *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*; for the “ *Trinity is the one God* \*.” The *Trinity* is the one only *God*, good, great, eternal, omnipotent, who is to himself unity, deity, magnitude, goodness, omnipotence †. *Leo the Great* says, “ the whole *Trinity* “ together is one *God* ‡.” This doctrine is also asserted in the large creed ascribed, but very unjustly, to *Gregory Thaumaturgus*. *Opera*, p. 19.

\* Non ait nemo bonus nisi solus pater, sed nemo bonus nisi solus deus, in patris enim nomine, ipse per se pater, pronunciatur, in Dei vero et ipse, et filius, et spiritus sanctus, quia trinitas unus Deus. De Trinitate, lib. 5. cap. 8. *Opera*, vol. 3. p. 320.

† Et hæc trinitas unus Deus, Deus solus, bonus, magnus, æternus, omnipotens; ipse sibi unitas, deitas, magnitudo, bonitas, omnipotentia. De Trinitate, lib. 5. sect. 5. cap. 11. *Opera*, vol. 3. p. 322.

‡ Tota simul trinitas est unus Deus. Ser. 75. *Opera* p. 16c.

Also,

Also, whereas the Son had formerly been said to be inferior to the Father in his highest, or divine nature, as having been derived from him, the language now was, that, with respect to his divine nature, he was perfectly equal to the Father, and inferior only with respect to his human nature; and this is the language that continues to be held to this day. “The Father,” says a writer whose work has been ascribed to Athanasius, “is said in the scriptures to be greater than the Son; but it is neither in magnitude, in time, nor in nature; but as the father of a son made man; and on account of his being made man, he is less than the angels\*.” “Whatever mean things,” says Athanasius himself, “are said of Christ, they respect that state of poverty which he assumed, that we might be made rich, and must not give occasion to blaspheme the son of God†.” “The Father,” says Am-

\* Μείζων ο πατήρ τε υιου γεγραπται, ουτε δε οσκω, ουτε χρονω, ουτε ϑυσει, αλλ’ ως πατήρ υιου ενανθρωπησαντος. δια δε την ενανθρωπησιν κ’ των αγγελων ηλατῶσθαι αυτον λεγει ο αποστολος. De Trinitate, Dial. 2. Opera, vol. 2. p. 188.

† Οσα εν ευεληρη ρηματι υπο τε κυριε ειρηται, τη πτωχεία αυτε διαφείρει, ινα ημεις εν αυτοις πλετησωμεν, κχ ινα ημεις

brose, “gave the revelation to Christ as a “man.” He adds, that “the Son likewise “gave it to himself, viz. his divinity to his “humanity \*.” “The Father,” says Theophylact, “is the God of Christ, according “to his humanity, and his Father according “to his divinity †.”

This new doctrine furnished the orthodox with a short and easy answer to every objection that could be made to the divinity of Christ, from his being represented as a mere man in the scriptures. “All the “low phrases,” says Theodoret, “we apply to Christ as a man, and the lofty ones “as God; and this demonstration of the “truth is very convenient to us ‡.” This

εν αυτοις βλασφημισωμεν κατὰ τὴν οὐκ τὴν θεῶν. *De Humana Natura, Opera*, vol. 1. p. 599.

\* Apocalypsis, revelatio vel manifestatio interpretatur. Quod revelationis donum et pater filio dedit, secundum quod homo erat, et filius sibi ipse, divinitas scilicet homini quem assumpsit. In *Apoc. cap. 1. Opera*, vol. 5. p. 365.

† Θεὸς μὲν γὰρ τὸ χρίστος, κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον· πατὴρ δὲ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα. In *Rom. cap. 15. Opera*, vol. 2. p. 144.

‡ Νυν γὰρ τοὺς μὲν ταπεινοὺς τῶν λόγων ὡς ἀνθρώπων προσεπιποιμεν, τοὺς δὲ ὑψηλοὺς καὶ θεοπρετοὺς ὡς θεῶν, καὶ εὐπρεπὴς ἂν ἡμῖν εἴη ἡ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀποδείξις. *Epist. 21. Opera*, vol. 3. p. 916.

language

language is frequent with Chrysostom. But the convenience which these writers so much boast of was unknown to their ancestors in orthodoxy, who always supposed, as truth and common sense requires, that whenever Christ is spoken of, his whole nature, and not a part of it only, was intended. On this principle Irenæus argued with the Gnostics.

When the doctrine of Christ being the creator of the world was first advanced, he was represented as having created all things by the order of the Father. But now this was not thought to be sufficient. Idacius, writing against Varimadus, the Arian, does not admit that the Son made the world by the Father's order, but says, that he did it "by his own power and will, and that he "governs them by his providence;" proving this from Isaiah, *Thus saith the Lord, I have made the earth by my word, and created man upon it* \*.

\* Si tibi dixerint : quia filius jussione patris fecit, quæ facta sunt. Resp. Non ut ipse adstruis filium jussione patris fecisse, quæ facta sunt, sed sui imperio et voluntate universa creavit, quæ creanda fore providentia sua per-

Also, whereas it had been said that the Son was the *servant* of the Father, and ministered to him, it was now observed that this service was reciprocal. “The Father,” says Cyril of Alexandria, “ministers to the Son, as the Psalmist says, ‘Sit thou at my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool †.’”

On this idea of the perfect equality of the Son to the Father, Chrysostom observes, that “sometimes the name of Christ is placed before that of the Father ‡.”

It had been thought to be peculiar to the Father to be *invisible*; but Cerealis says,

spexit, Esaia propheta dicente: hæc dicit dominus: ego feci sermone meo terram, et hominem super eam, ego solidavi cælum manu, ego omnibus syderibus mandavi, ut luceant in cælo. Bib. Pat. vol. 5. p. 380.

† Pater vero ministrat filio, ut canit Psalmista: sede a dextris meis, donec ponam inimicos tuos scabellum pedum tuorum. Si ergo pater, quamvis ministret filio, minor tamen ipso propterea non est: nec filius quia patri subicitur, minor patre putandus est. Thesaurus, cap. 8. Opera, vol. 2. p. 304.

\* Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἀδελφεὸς ὁ υἱὸς διὰ τὸ μὲν πατέρα κεισθαι, ἐπειδὴ ἑλθὼν ἀπὸ τοῦ χρίστου ἀρξάμενος ὁ ἀποστόλος ἐπὶ τοῦ πατέρα ἐρχέσθαι, τὸ αὐτὸ ποιεῖν. In Gal. 1. Opera, vol. 10. p. 964.

“ the



“ the Son is invisible, because none can  
 “ know him but the Father \*.”

The principles of the later and more rigid doctrine of the trinity are most clearly expressed in what is called *the Athanasian creed*, whoever was the author of it. We are there told, “ there is one hypostasis of  
 “ the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Spirit; but there is  
 “ one deity of the Father, Son, and Spirit,  
 “ their glory equal, their majesty co-eternal.  
 “ Such as the Father is, such is the Son,  
 “ and such the Holy Spirit †.” The importance of holding this absurd faith was deemed to be so great, that the same creed, having pronounced this to be *the catholic faith*, denounces, that “ if any person does  
 “ not hold it wholly and undefiled, he must,

\* Quia invisibilis est filius sic docetur. Nemo novit filium nisi pater, neque patrem quis novit nisi filius. Bib. Pat. vol. 5. p. 451.

† Ἀλλή γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ τῶ πατρὸς ὑποστάσις. ἄλλη τῶ υἱοῦ, καὶ ἄλλη τῶ ἁγίου πνεύματος. ἀλλὰ πατὴρ καὶ υἱὸς καὶ ἁγίον πνεῦμα, μία ἐστὶ θεότης, ἰσὴ δόξα, συνδιακονίζουσα ἡ μεγαλειότης· οἷος ὁ πατὴρ, τοιοῦτος καὶ ὁ υἱός, τοιοῦτον καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἁγίου.—Αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ καθολικὴ πίστις, ἣν εἰ μὴ τις πιστῶς τε καὶ βεβαίως πεφύκεται, σωθῆναι οὐ δύνηται. Athanasii, Opera, vol. 2. p. 32.

“ without

“without doubt, perish everlastingly \*.”  
 The stile of this Athanasian creed occurs in Austin on the trinity, where he says, that “each of the three persons is God, “yet there are not three Gods. Each of “them is great and good, and yet there “are not three that are great or good, but “only one †.”

I shall now proceed with my extracts from the orthodox Fathers, in which their agreement with the principles of this creed, and their disagreement with those of the Antenicene Fathers, will be still more apparent.

\* *Ἦν εἰ μὴ τις ὑγίη καὶ ἀμώμων τηρήσειεν, πάσης ἀμφιβολίας ἐκτός, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἀπολείπει.* Athanasii, Opera, vol. 2. p. 32.

† *Ut quicquid de singulis ad seipsum dicit, non pluraliter in summa sed singulariter accipiatur. Quemadmodum enim pater Deus est, et filius Deus est, et spiritus sanctus Deus est, quod secundum substantiam dici nemo dubitat, non tamen tres Deos, sed unum Deum dicimus eandem ipsam præstantissimam trinitatem: ita magnus pater, magnus filius, magnus spiritus sanctus, non tamen tres magni, sed unus magnus. Non enim de patre solo, sicut illi perversi sentiunt, sed de patre et filio et spiritu sancto scriptum est, tu es Deus solus magnus; et bonus pater, bonus filius, bonus spiritus sanctus, nec tres boni, sed unus est bonus, de quo dictum est: nemo bonus nisi solus Deus.* Lib. 5. cap. 8. Opera, vol. 3. p. 320.

“The

“ The trinity,” says Austin, “ is of one  
 “ and the same nature and substance, not  
 “ less in each than in all, nor greater in all  
 “ than in each; as great in the Father only,  
 “ or in the Son only, as in the Father and  
 “ the Son together; and as great in the  
 “ Holy Spirit alone, as in the Father, Son,  
 “ and Holy Spirit. Nor did the Father  
 “ demean himself that he might generate  
 “ a Son out of himself; but he so gene-  
 “ rated another self out of himself, that he  
 “ remained wholly in himself, and was in  
 “ the Son as much as when he was alone \*.”

“ The Son,” says Basil, “ is all that the  
 “ Father is †.” “ There is,” says Gre-  
 gory Nyssen, “ a whole Father in a whole

\* Hæc trinitas unus est ejusdemque naturæ atque sub-  
 stantiæ, non minor in singulis, quam in omnibus: nec  
 major in omnibus, quam in singulis, sed tanta in solo pa-  
 tre vel in solo filio, quanta in patre simul et filio, et tanta  
 in solo spiritu sancto, quanta simul in patre et filio et spi-  
 ritu sancto. Neque enim pater ut haberet filium de se-  
 ipso, minuit seipsum, sed ita genuit de se alterum se, ut  
 totus maneret in se, et esset in filio tantus quantus et solus.  
 Epist. 66. Opera, vol. 2. p. 319.

† Πᾶσις ὡς ὅσα ἐστὶν ὁ πατήρ. De Fide, Opera, vol. I.  
 p. 430.

“ Son,

“ Son, and a whole Son in a whole Father\*.” This writer expresses his idea of the importance of this mysterious doctrine in the following manner: “ If the confession of the holy trinity be useless, all the institutions of the church are absurd, baptism, confession of sin, obedience to the commands, good morals, temperance, justice, moderation, fortitude †.”

“ Whoever,” says Gregory Nazianzen, “ maintains any of the three persons to be inferior to the other, overturns the whole trinity ‡.” Jerom says, that “ since Christ is the power of God, and the wisdom of God, he has all the Fa-

\* Εἰ δὲ ὅλος ὁ πατήρ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ υἱῷ, καὶ ὅλος ὁ υἱὸς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ πατρὶ. Opera, vol. 2. p. 901.

† Εἰ γὰρ ἀχρηστὸς μὲν ἡ τῶν σεμνῶν τε καὶ τιμιῶν τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος ὀνομάτων ἐμύλησις, ἀνονήα δὲ τὰ ἐθὴ ἐκκλησίας, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐδεσὶ τῆσις ἐστὶν ἡ σφραγίς, ἡ προσευχή, τὸ βαπτισμα, ἡ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἐξαγορευσις, ἡ περὶ τὰς ἐντολάς προθυμία, ἡ περὶ τὸ ἦθος καλορθεσίς, τὸ κατὰ ζωφροσύνην βίβη, τὸ πρὸς τὸ δίκαιον βλέπειν, τὸ μὴ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις ἐδιζέσθαι, μὴτε ἡδονῆς ἡττάσθαι, μὴτε ἀρεῆς ἀπολειπεσθαι. Contra Eunomium, Or. 10. Opera, vol. 2. p. 277.

‡ Καὶ ὁ, τί ἂν τῶν τριῶν καλῶ θώμεν, τὸ πᾶν καθαιρεῖν νομίζομεν. Or. 20. Opera, p. 338.

“ ther’s

“ther’s perfections\*.” Chrysoſtom gives the preference to the Father only in name. “I name the Father firſt,” ſays he, “not on account of his rank, but becauſe he is the Father of the only begotten ;” and at the ſame time, he ſays, that “there is no thing improper in naming the Son before the Father†.” “There is no difference,” ſays Theodoret, “between the Father and the Son, but in generating and being generated, in emitting and proceeding‡.” “If any one,” ſays Pope Damafus, “does not ſay that the Father, Son, and Spirit, have one godhead, power, dominion, glory, and authority, one king-

\* Cum enim Chriſtus Dei virtus fit, deque ſapientia, omnes in ſe virtutes continet patris. In Eſaiam, lib. 12. Opera, vol. 4. p. 140.

† Λεγω πάλῃρα πρῶτον, ὃ τῇ τάξει πρῶτον, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἐννοίᾳ, ἐπεὶ δὴ γεννητῶρ τῶ μονογενοῦς, ἐπεὶ δὴ ἡ ρίζα τῶ ἁγίου καρπῶ. Ἀρα εἰ τις ἐβόλησεν εἰπεῖν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὁ χριςτος ὑμῶς εὐλογησέι, καὶ ὁ πάλῃρ αὐτῶς, ὡς ἀλάλῳς ἐνομιζέιτο; Ser. 4. Opera, vol. 6. p. 34.

‡ Α. Οὐκ ἐστὶν ὁ διαφορά πάλῃρος, καὶ υἱῶς, καὶ ἁγίου πνευματος. Ο. Ἐν τῇ φύσει ὁ ἐν τῷ θελημάτι ὁ ἐν τῷ γεννᾶν καὶ γεννασθᾶν, καὶ ἐκπεμπεῖν καὶ ἐκπορευέσθαι, καὶ. Dial. Adv. Anomæos. Op. vol. 5. p. 275.

“ dom,

“ dom, one will, and one truth, let him be  
 “ anathema\*.”

“ The Son,” says Ambrose, “ knows the  
 “ will of the Father, and the Father that of  
 “ the Son ; and the Son hears the Father al-  
 “ ways, and the Father the Son, by an union  
 “ of nature, will, and substance †.” “ The  
 “ Father,” says M. Caleca, “ is a whole  
 “ God, the Son a whole God, and the  
 “ Spirit a whole God ‡.” According to this  
 language, it would certainly have been  
 most natural to say, that there were *three*  
*Gods* ; and this, indeed, is sometimes tacitly  
 acknowledged ; but the scriptures hav-  
 ing expressly asserted the contrary, these

\* Εἰ τις μὴ εἴπῃ τὸ παῖρος, καὶ τὸ υἱός, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἓν,  
 μίαν θεοῦσιν, ἐξουσίαν, δύναμειαν μίαν, δόξαν, κυριότην μίαν, βασιλείαν  
 μίαν, βελήσιν, καὶ ἀληθειαν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Theodoriti, Hist. lib.  
 5. cap. 11. p. 211.

† Scit autem semper filius voluntatem patris, et pater  
 filii, et audit patrem filius semper, et pater filium per uni-  
 tatem naturæ, voluntatis atque substantiæ. Hex. lib. 2.  
 Opera, vol. 1. p. 22.

‡ Καὶ γὰρ ὁ παῖς θεὸς ὅλος, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς θεὸς ὅλος, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ  
 ἅγιον θεὸς ὅλος. Comibefis Auditarium, vol. 2. p. 203.

writers

writers could not do it *in words*. “To say  
“that there are more Gods than one,” says  
Hilary, “is irreligious\*.”

---

## S E C T I O N II.

*Of the new Language introduced at and after  
the Council of Nice.*

NEW ideas always require new terms;  
and unfortunately the nice distinctions  
which were now made with respect to the  
doctrine of the trinity, required more words  
than had ever been used by theologians be-  
fore; nor was there any thing in the Greek  
philosophy to correspond to the distinctions  
that were now to be expressed. Besides, the  
Latin tongue was much less copious than  
the Greek; and this afforded a new source  
of embarrassment and contradiction among  
those who wished to say the same thing.

To express the difference between the  
three persons, it was necessary to have one

\* Quia et Deos dici irreligiosum est. Lib. II. p. 271.

term which might be applied to them all, and another to each of them separately. For though they were *one* in a certain respect, that is, as God, they must be called *three* in another (i. e.) as persons in the godhead. The two terms that were candidates for this latter office in the Greek language were *ουσια* and *υποστασις*, *essence* and *hypostasis*; and though it was acknowledged, that in the Greek philosophy these words had been used without any difference, it was thought necessary to make a distinction between them now.—Theodoret, after observing that, “in the  
 “external philosophy there was no differ-  
 “ence between essence and hypostasis, with  
 “the Fathers they differed as *common* and  
 “*particular*, or as *genus* and *species*, or *indi-*  
 “*vidual*\*.” Socrates says, that “the word  
 “*hypostasis* was not used by the ancient phi-  
 “losophers, but that by the moderns it was  
 “always used for *essence*†.”

\* Κατα δὲ γε τὴν τῶν παλίων διδασκαλίαν ἡν ἔχει διαφορὰν τὸ κοινὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἰδίου, ἢ τὸ γένος ὑπὲρ τοῦ εἶδος, ἢ τὸ ἀτομικόν, ταύτην οὐσια πρὸς τὴν ὑποστάσιν ἔχει. Dial. 1. Opera, vol. 1. p. 4.

† Ἰστέον μὲντοι εἶναι καὶ τοὺς παλαιοὺς φιλοσόφους τὴν λέξιν ἀρετικῶς, ἀλλὰ οὐκ οἱ νεώτεροι τῶν φιλοσόφων συνεχῶς ἀντὶ τῆς οὐσίας, τῇ λέξει τῆς ὑποστάσεως ἀπεχρησάμενοι. Hist. lib. 3. cap. 7. p. 180.



Before the Arian controversy it had, as I have observed, been uniformly said by the orthodox, that the Father and the Son were different in their essence. Origen expressly says this, as well as that the Son was subject to the Father \*. Also Athanasius, in his fifth oration against the Arians, maintains, that *essence* and *hypostasis* mean the same thing. The author of a treatise ascribed to him says, “ whoever asserts that there  
“ are three hypostasis, that is, three sub-  
“ stances, he, under the name of piety, as-  
“ serts three natures †;” and this, accord-  
ing to the orthodox, constituted the poly-  
theism of the Arians. “ Accordingly, it  
“ was agreed,” says Sozomen, “ in a coun-  
“ cil held at Alexandria, which Athanasius  
“ attended, that the word *essence* should be  
“ avoided, except in disputing with the Sa-  
“ bellians ‡.” It was also maintained in the

\* Εἰ γὰρ εἷρως, ὡς ἐν ἄλλοις δεικνύται, καὶ ἔσαν, καὶ ὑποκειμενός  
ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τῷ πατρί. De Oratione, p. 48.

† Quisquis autem tres ὑποστάσεις dicit, id est, tres sub-  
stantias, is sub nomine pietatis tres naturas conatur asserere.  
Opera, vol. 2. p. 581.

‡ Ἐν τούτῳ δὲ πολλῶν πόλεων ἐπισκοποὶ συνελθόντες εἰς Ἀλεξάνδριαν  
αὐτῷ Ἀθανασίῳ καὶ Εὐσεβίῳ, τὰ δεδύγμενα ἐν Νίκαια κρᾶνόντων ὁμοουσίων

council of Sardica, at which Athanasius was present, that “there is one essence of the Father, Son, and Spirit, which *essence* the heretics call *hypostasis* \*.”

It was with respect to this difference about *essence* and *hypostasis*, that Gregory Nazianzen says, “it was ridiculous, though lamentable, that so a small difference in words should occasion a difference in faith;” and that “Athanasius perceiving it was a difference in words only, having addressed both parties with gentleness and good nature, and after carefully examining the meaning of the words, when he found that the two parties did not differ in sense, gave them liberty with respect to words, but held them strictly

τε τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ υἱῷ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ὡμολογήσαν καὶ τριάδα ὠνομαίσαν· ἢ μόνῳ τε σωματί, ἀλλὰ καὶ ψυχῇ τελείῳ χρηναὶ δοξάζειν ἀνθρώπῳ, ἐν ᾧ θεὸς λόγος ἀνελάβεν, εἰσηγήσαντο, καὶ τοῖς παλαῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς φιλοσόφοις ἔδοκει· ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ περὶ τῆς ὕψους καὶ ὑποστάσεως ζήτησις τὰς ἐκκλησίας εἰσέραττε, καὶ συχνὰ περὶ τέλων ἐρίδες καὶ διαλέξεις ἦσαν, εὐ μάλα σφῶς μοι δοκῶσιν οἰσθαι, μὴ ἐξ ἀρχῆς εὐθὺς ἐπὶ θεοτέλεις χρησθῆναι τοῖς ὀνόμασι, πλὴν ἡνικα τις τὴν Σαβέλλιον δοξάν ἐκβαλλεῖν πειρώσῃ. Lib. 5. cap. 12. p. 198.

\* Ἡμεῖς δὲ ταύτην παρρητήσαμεν καὶ δεδιδάμεθα, καὶ ταύτην ἐχομεν τὴν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν παραδοσιν καὶ πιστὴν καὶ ὁμολογίαν, μίαν εἶναι  
 ὑπόστασιν

“ bound with respect to the things signified  
“ by them\*.”

The Latins having no terms to express both *essence* and *hypostasis*, as is observed by Gregory Nazianzen †, used the word *substance* to express both; and, accordingly, they were much chagrined at the Greeks for making any difference between them. Jerom expresses his resentment on this subject, saying, that, “ in the secular schools they  
“ had no difference; and who,” says he,  
“ will dare to say there are three substances.  
“ Let it suffice us to say there is one sub-  
“ stance, and three subsisting persons, per-

υποσασιν ην αυλοι οι αιρετικοι εστιαν προσαγορευεσι, τς παλρος και τς  
υις κ' αγις πνευματος. Theodoriti, Hist. lib. 2. cap. 8. p. 81.

\* Ως λαν γελοιον ηελειον π' εως εδοξε διαφορα η περι τον ηχου  
μικρολογια—Ταυτ' εν ορην κ' ακων ο μακαριος εκειν<sup>Θ</sup>· προσκαλεσα-  
μεν<sup>Θ</sup> αμφοτερα τα μερη ειωσι παρας κ' φιλανθρωπως, κ' τον νεν-  
των λεγομενων ακριβως εξελασας, επειδη συμφρονεντας ευρε, κ' αθεν διε-  
ωις καλα τον λογον, τα ονομαλα συγχωρητας, συνδει τοις πραγμασι.  
Or. 22. p. 395, 396.

† Της γαρ μιας ουσιας, κ' των τριων υποσασεων λεγομενων μεν υφ'  
ημων ενσεβως· το μεν γαρ την φυσιν δηλοι της θεοτης, το δε τας των τριων  
ιδιοτητας, νομενων δε κ' παρα τοις Ιταλοις ομοιως, αλλ' ε δυναμενοις δια  
γεννητα της παρ' αυλοις γλωττης κ' ονοματων πνεαν, διελεν απο της  
ουσιας την υποσασιν, κ' δια τατο ανεισαγωγης τα προσωπα· ινα μη  
τρεις εσαι παραδειχθωσι. Or. 21. p. 395.

fectly equal, and co-eternal. Let us say nothing of *three hypostases*, but keep to *one* \*. Austin also thought that no difference should be made between essence and hypostasis, and said, that in Latin they said indifferently, that there was one essence, or substance, and three persons †. This is likewise asserted by G. Nazianzen in the passage quoted above.

Notwithstanding the dislike that was taken to the word *essence*, it was thought necessary to make use of it at the council of Nice, in order to censure the Arians, who held that the Son was created out of nothing; and if the term *essence* be the same with *substance*, and the *logos* be, as the orthodox said, *God of God*, or one God made out of another, the term *ὁμοῦσις*, *con-*

\* Tota sæcularum literarum schola nihil aliud hypostasin, nisi usiam, novit. Et quis, rogo, ore sacrilego tres substantias prædicabit?—Sufficiat nobis dicere, unam substantiam, tres personas subsistentes, perfectas, æquales, co-æternas. Taceantur tres hypostases: si placet, et una teneatur. Epist. 57. Opera, vol. 1. p. 417.

† Non audiemus dicere unam essentiam, tres substantias, sed unam essentiam vel substantiam, tres autem personas. De Trinitate, lib. 5. cap. 9. Opera, vol. 3. p. 321.

*substantial*,

*substantial*, was, no doubt, very proper to express their idea of his origin, as opposed to that of the Arians. An account of the objections that were made to the use of the term at that time, of the reasons for adopting it, and of the sense in which it was admitted, is thus given by the historian Socrates. He says, that “ the term *con-*  
“ *substantial* was objected to as implying  
“ the production of one thing from an-  
“ other, either according to *division*, or  
“ *fluxion*, or *prolation*; prolation signifying  
“ the production of a branch from a root;  
“ fluxion that of children from a father;  
“ and division the making two or three  
“ masses of gold from one; and that the  
“ generation of the Son resembles none of  
“ these \*.”

In defence of the term it was said, that  
“ God is not to be considered as a material  
“ being, but as immaterial, intellectual,  
“ and incorporeal, and therefore incapable

\* Επει γαρ εφασαν ομοουσιον ειναι, ο εκ τινος εστιν, η κατὰ  
μερισμον, η κατὰ ρευσιν, η κατὰ προβολην • κατὰ προβολην  
μεν, ως εκ ριζων βλασημα • κατὰ δε ρευσιν, ως οι πατρικοι  
παιδες • κατὰ μερισμον δε, ως βωλε χρυσιδες δυο η τρεις •  
κατ’ υδεν δε τυτων εστιν ο υιος. Hist. lib. i. cap. 8. p. 22.

“ of any bodily affections ; and that the  
 “ subject is to be considered in a divine  
 “ and hidden manner\*.” At length, it  
 was interpreted to mean “ from no other  
 “ essence or hypostasis, than that of the  
 “ Father only† ;” so that the *mode* of  
 production, about which they could not  
 agree, was left undetermined.

The reasoning of Chrysostom on this  
 subject seems to be fair, and to justify the  
 Fathers of Nice. For he says, that “ every  
 “ thing that is generated is always con-  
 “ substantial with that which generates, not  
 “ in man only, but in all living creatures,  
 “ and in plants‡ ;” that is, every thing  
 produces its like ; and the maxim must  
 apply to the case of the Divine Being, as

\* Μηδε γαρ δυνασθαι την αυλον η νοεραν, η ασωμαϊον φυσιν, σω-  
 ματικον τι παθος υφιστασθαι . δειοις δε η απορρητοις ρημασι, προσηκει  
 τα τοιαυτα νοειν. Hist. lib. i. cap. 8. p. 24.

† Και μη ειναι εξ ελεως τε υποστασεως η ρσιως, αλλ' εκ τε παλρος.  
 Ibid. p. 25.

‡ Τελο γαρ οχι ταις γραφαις μονον, αλλα η τη κοιη παντων των  
 ανθρωπων ουση, η τη των πραγματων φυσει μαχομεγον ειν . οτι γαρ  
 ομοεσις ο γεννηθεις τω γεννησαντι, εκ επ ανθρωπων μονον, αλλα η επι  
 ζων ανων, η επι δευδων τελο ιδοι τις αν. Hom. 32. Opera,  
 vol. i. p. 406.

well as to every other ; so that if the Son was really produced from the Father, from his own essence, and not created out of nothing, he must necessarily be consubstantial with the Father.

Still, however, the term *essence* was not relished. The reason of this is more particularly given by Socrates, who says, that “ the word essence, though used with simplicity by the Fathers, yet being unknown to the common people, and not being contained in the scriptures, gave offence ; so that it was thought proper to disuse it, and that no mention should be made of the essence of God for the future ; but that it should rather be said, that the Son is like to the Father in all things\*.”

Notwithstanding the opposition made by the Latin church, the language adopted by the council of Nice continued to be in use ; though even so late as the time of

\* Το δε ονομα της υσιος δια το απλυστερον υπο των πατερων τεθεισθαι, αγνοουμενον δε υπο των λαων, σκανδαλον φερειν. δια το μηδε τας γραφας τελω περιεχειν. ηρεσε τελω περιαιρεθηναι κη πανηλωως μηδεμιαν μνημην υσιος επι δευ ειναι τε λοιπα, δια το τας θειας γραφας μηδαμυς περι παλρος κη υιυ υσιος μεμνησθαι. ομοιον δε λεγομεν τον υιον του πατρός κη πατρία. Hist. lib. 2. cap. 37. p. 137.

Basil, the signification of these terms was not so well settled, but that many persons, he says, confounded *essence* with *hypostasis*\*.

The term φύσις, *nature*, it seems, had been proposed by some, but with respect to the doctrine of the trinity, Gregory Nazianzen says, that he preferred the word *essence*†. And in time the term *essence* was established as the general name, applicable to each of the three persons, and *hypostasis* was applied to them severally‡; so that it was thought proper to say that the trinity consisted of *three hypostases in one essence*; and also the term προσωπον, *person*, was used as synonymous to *hypostasis*§. This term was proba-

\* Επειδή πολλοὶ το κοινὸν τῆς ἑσίας, ἐπὶ τῶν μυστικῶν δογματικῶν, μὴ διάκρονοντες ἀπὸ τῆ τῶν ὑποστάσεων λογῆς, ταῖς αὐταῖς συνεμπιπλοῦσιν ὑπονοοῖαις : καὶ οἰοῦνται διαφέρειν μηδὲν ἑσὶαν ἢ ὑποστάσιν λεγείν. Epist. Opera, vol. 3. p. 63.

† Ἦν ἂν τις ὀρθῶς, ἑσὶαν μάλλον ἢ φύσιν καλοῖτο. Or. 45. p. 717.

‡ Substantiæ (φύσεως) declaratio videtur sicut commune et universale quiddam esse, nomina vero substantientiarum singularum (ὑποστάσεις) sub illo universale prædicantur. Cyril. Alex. De Trinitate, lib. 1. Opera, vol. 2. p. 362.

§ Ὅτι μὲν ἐν, τῇ ἑσὶα γινώσκοντες, καὶ τῷ ἀμερίστῳ τῆς προσκυνήσεως. τὰ δὲ τρία, ταῖς ὑποστάσεσιν εἰς ἓν προσωποῖς, οὐ τισὶ φίλον. Gr. Nazianzeni, Opera, Or. 32. p. 520.



bly borrowed from the Latin *persona*, which was always used in the Latin church to denote the difference between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; for they said that there were *three persons in one divine essence*, or God. This, however, was deviating a little from the original use of the term, which expressed a difference of *character*, such as the same person might appear in at different times, and therefore favoured a little of Sabellianism.

Notwithstanding every thing seemed to be so well settled about the meaning of these terms, yet as they were applied to a subject concerning which men could not pretend to have any ideas, they were no more than mere *sounds*; and those who pretended to see farther into the subject than others still continued to differ, and even to refine about the use of the terms; and the most ancient signification was not wholly lost sight of. Thus Damascenus says, that “ the word *hypothesis* has two significations, viz. one of mere existence, in which it does not differ from *substance*, and sometimes that which subsists of  
“ itself,

“ itself, by which individuals of the same  
 “ species are distinguished, as Peter and  
 “ Paul \*;” that is, *hypostasis* may in one  
 sense be used for *essence*, to which, as I have  
 observed, it was originally synonymous.

---

### S E C T I O N III.

#### *Illustrations of the Doctrine of the Trinity.*

**H**AVING settled this new doctrine of  
 the trinity, and ascertained the use of  
 the terms in which it was thought proper  
 to express it, I come to give a view of the  
 principal *illustrations* of it. For though it  
 was spoken of as a greater *mystery* than  
 ever, and we are cautioned not to expect

\* *Hypostaseos nomen duplicem significationem habet. Interdum enim simplicem existentiam significat. Quo significatione inter substantiam et hypostasim nihil interest. Unde etiam nonnulli sanctorum patrum, naturas, hoc est hypostases ipsas appellarunt. Interdum rursus eam, quæ per se est, ac seorsim subsistit, existentiam; qua significatione individuum id quod numero differt, significat, ut Petrum, Paulum, ac certum aliquem equum. Dialectica, cap. 42. Opera, p. 641.*

to find any thing in nature to resemble it; yet every writer, who thought that he had hit upon any thing that would contribute to make the reception of it more easy, did not fail to enlarge upon his own conceit. Some writers have done this with a considerable degree of confidence; and by this means we may clearly perceive what it was that, in their opinion, constituted the relation of the three persons to each other. But in all their schemes, the nature of the subject restricted them to a choice of two insuperable difficulties, each of them fatal to the doctrine of any proper *trinity in unity*; for either the *trinity* or the *unity* was necessarily abandoned.

Photius very truly observes, that, “to  
“recite all the answers which the Fathers  
“have given to the question, why, when  
“the Father, Son, and Spirit, are each of  
“them separately God, we should not say,  
“that there are *three Gods*? would make a  
“book, instead of an epistle\*.” I shall  
not therefore attempt to give them all.

\* Ερώτας, πως εστι λεγειν, θεον τον πατερα, θεον τον υιον, θεον το πνευμα, και μη εις αναγκην περιττασθαι, τρεις, ανθ ενος, θεες ανωμο-λογειν. Εγω σοι σαφως και συντομως ερω. Παράδειγμα μιν γαρ πολλα

The following explications are such as are favourable to the unity of the divine nature, but unfavourable to a trinity.—Fire, says a writer whose work has been ascribed to Athanasius, “ is one, but has  
“ three hypostases: its burning power is  
“ one, and its shining power another; so  
“ that there are three hypostases in one  
“ fire, viz. the fire, its burning power, and  
“ its shining power; and yet the nature  
“ of the fire is one, and not three. So  
“ also with respect to God \*.” This is only giving one being two properties, to which no unitarian will object.

Basil says, “ the greatest proof of the  
“ connexion between the Spirit and the  
“ Father and the Son, is, that it has the  
“ same relation to the Father that the spirit

πολλά και ποικίλα, τοῖς θεοῖς ἡμῶν πάλασιν, εἰς τὸ διαλυταὶ τὴν ἀπο-  
ρίαν ταύτην ὑπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας, ὑπερ ἧς ἐσπῶδαζον, ἀφθονῶς τε  
χρηρηθῇ καὶ εἰς θεὸν διαλείπειν· ὧν ἐλπίς ἐπιμνησθῆναι θέλησται βιβλίον  
ἐλὼν ἀντ' ἐπιστολῆς αὐτῆς γράψαι· Εἰσφ. p. 214.

\* Ἰδού το πῦρ ἐν ἐστὶ, ἀλλῶς καὶ τρισυποστάσιον· αὐτὸ νάρ ἐν ἐστὶ το ὑποκειμενον πῦρ, τὸ δὲ καυσικὸν αὐτῆς ἔλεγον προσώπων, καὶ τὸ φώτισικον αὐτῆς ἄλλον προσώπων. Ἰδὺ λοιπὸν τρία πρόσωπα τῆς ἐνὸς πυρὸς, ἡγὰρ το ὑποκειμενον πῦρ, καὶ τὸ καυσικόν, καὶ τὸ φώτισικόν, μία δὲ φύσις τῆς πυρὸς, καὶ οὐ τρεῖς· ὁμοίως καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς θείας. *Questiones alia, Opera*, vol. 2. p. 440.

“ of

“ of a man has to the man \*.” To this illustration also no unitarian will have any objection; and still less to that of Marius Victorinus, who, in his hymn concerning the trinity, says, “ when thou retest thou  
“ art the Father, when thou proceedest the  
“ Son, as uniting all into one, thou art the  
“ Holy Spirit. †.” After this we cannot wonder that the Arians, as the author of a work ascribed to Athanasius complains, should charge the Trinitarians with Sabelianism, because they made God and the Son to be one ‡.

In the famous controversy between Rabbi Nachmanides, before the king of Aragon in 1263, the christian disputant made a trinity of the wisdom, the will, and the intellect of God; and the king il-

\* Το δε μεγιστον τεκμηριον της προς τον πατερα χ' υιον τε πνευματος συναφειας, οτι βίως εχειν λεγεται προς τον θεον, ως προς εκαστον εχει το πνευμα το εν ημιν. De Sp. S. cap. 16. Opera, vol. 2. p. 329.

† Tu cum quiescis pater es, cum procedis filius,

In unum qui cuncta neces, tu es spiritus sanctus.

Bib. Pat. vol. 5. p. 360.

‡ Συ Σαβελλιος ει · ΑΘ. ειπεν δια τι ειμι Σαβελλιος · ΑΡ. ειπεν· επειδη ειπας, ο πατηρ χ' ο υιος εν εστιν. Disp. contra Aruim, Opera, vol. 1. p. 116.

illustrated

illustrated it by the properties of taste, colour, and smell in wine. But the Jew answered, that, upon this principle, he could prove God to be five-fold, because God had life, wisdom, will, power, and strength \*.

On the other hand, the great mass of comparisons that were made between the trinity and things in nature, shows that, in the opinion of the writers, the three persons, though nominally *one God*, were, in fact, considered as *three parts of one whole*, though some of them will be found to express *three wholes*, and to be only *one* by their possession of some common property. Indeed, the subject did not admit of any thing better.

The most conspicuous of the emblems of the trinity is that of the *sun*. “Know,” says the writer quoted above, whose work has been ascribed to Athanasius, “from

† Postea consurrexit Frater Raymundus, de trinitate verba faciens, aitque judæis: agnoscite tandem trinitatem. Deus enim sapientia, voluntate ac intellectu constat.— Cæterum, rex in hanc rem proponebat similitudinem, quam corrupti et corruptores magistri illum docuerant. Vino, inquit, tria hæc insunt: sapor, color, et odor, atque tria illa res eadem sunt. R. Nachman. p. 58. 59.

“ this

“ this, that as the sun has three persons, so  
 “ the one God has three persons : For the  
 “ sun’s disk is the type of the Father, the  
 “ beam is the type of the Son, and the  
 “ light is the type of the Holy Spirit. Say,  
 “ therefore, thus—In the sun there is a  
 “ disk, a beam, and light; but we do not  
 “ say there are three suns, but only one.  
 “ So likewise in God the Father, Son, and  
 “ Holy Spirit, are not three Gods, but one  
 “ God\*.” But it is obvious to remark,  
 that neither the beam of light, nor the light  
 itself, can be called a *sun*, as the Son and  
 Holy Spirit are called God. Equally de-  
 fective is Basil’s comparison of the three  
 persons in the trinity to the rainbow and its  
 colours, “ the substance of which,” he says,  
 “ is one, but their distinction manifest,  
 “ though they run into one another †.”

\* Και εκ τούτου γιγνώσκει, ὅτι ὡς περ ὁ ἥλιος ἐστὶ τριπροσωπος, ἕως,  
 καὶ εἰς θεὸς τρισυποστατός· τυπὸς γὰρ τῷ πατρὶ ἐστὶ ὁ δίσκος ὁ ἡλιακός,  
 τυπὸς τῷ υἱῷ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀκτίς, τυπὸς τῷ ἁγίῳ πνευμᾷ ἐστὶ τὸ φῶς τῷ ἡλίῳ·  
 καὶ εἴτε ἕως, ἔπειτα τῷ ἡλίῳ, δίσκος, ἀκτίς, καὶ φῶς· καὶ λεγόμεν δὲ τρεῖς  
 ἡλίες, ἀλλὰ ἐνὰ καὶ μόνον· ὁμοίως καὶ ἐπὶ θεῷ, πατὴρ, υἱός, καὶ ἅγιον  
 πνεῦμα εἰς θεὸς καὶ καὶ τρεῖς. Opera, vol. 2. p. 437.

† Ὡς περ γὰρ ἐκεῖνο ἐν μὲν ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν ἕσταν τῷ αἵρετι, πολλὰ δὲ  
 ἐν αὐτῷ χροματὰ φαίνονται, καὶ φανερώς τὰς διαφορὰς τούτων διαγιγνώσκο-

The pretended Dionysius Areopagita, with great ingenuity, compares the *union* and *distinctness* of the three persons in the trinity, to the perfect union, and perfect distinctness, of the light of a number of lamps in a room, none of which can be distinguished from that of the others; and yet that they are really distinct, appears by removing one of them, when it takes its own light only along with it, and leaves that which belonged to the rest \*.

To pass from the *sun* to *vision*, I shall here observe, that Austin says, “ we have  
“ an emblem of the trinity in the thing that  
“ is seen, the impression that it makes upon

μεν· ὁ δὲ δυνάμιον δὲ τῇ αἰσθησέῃ καὶ λαλᾷ τὴν διατάσιν τῆ ἐξέρῃ πρὸς τὸ εἶδον. M. Caleca in Combefis, vol. 2. p. 243.

\* Καὶ γὰρ ὁρῶμεν ἐν οἴκῳ πολλῶν ἐνοήτων λαμπτήρων, πρὸς ἐν τῇ φωτὶ ἐνεχόμενα, τὰ πάντων φῶτα, καὶ μίαν αἰγλήν ἀδιακρίτον ἀναλαμπόντα καὶ οἷον αὐτὸς, ὡς οἰομαι. δυνάμιον τε δὲ τῆ λαμπτήρος τοῦ φωτός ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων, ἐκ τῆ πάντων τὰ φῶτα περιεχοῦτος ἀέρος διακρίναι, καὶ ἰδεῖν ἀνευ θάλασσης θάλασσαν, ὅλων ἐν ὅλοις ἀμικρῶς συγκεκραμένων· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τὸν τῶν πυρρῶν ὑπεξαγαγόν τε δῶματις συνεξελευσταί καὶ τὸ οἰκίον ἀπὸ φωτός, ὅθεν τῇ τῶν ἐξέρων φῶτων ἐν αὐτῷ συνεπὶσπώμενον, ἢ τῆ αὐτῆς τοῖς ἐξέρῃς καὶ λαλεῖται. De Divinis Nominibus, cap. 2. p. 170.

“ the



“ the eye, and the sense of vision †.” But this is still more defective than the preceding.

The greatest number of illustrations of the trinity, by the ancients, is drawn from the consideration of the *mind of man* and its properties; and they were led to look for these illustrations here, rather than in other parts of nature; because man, being made after the image of God, they took it for granted that he must resemble the trinity.

Gregory Nyssen says, that “ God made  
“ such a creature as man, because he intend-  
“ ed to publish the mystery of the holy tri-  
“ nity, that being difficult to be under-  
“ stood, man might have in himself an

† Itaque potissimum testimonio utamur oculorum. Is enim sensus corporis maxime excellit, et est visioni mentis pro sui generis diversitate vicinior. Cum igitur aliquod corpus videmus, hæc tria, quod facillimum est, consideranda sunt et dignoscenda. Prima ipsa res quam videmus, sive lapidem, sive aliquam flammam, sive quid aliud quod videri oculis potest, quod utique jam esse poterat, et antequam videretur. Deinde visio quæ non erat, priusquam rem illam objectam sensui sentiremus. Tertio quod in ea re quæ videtur, quamdiu videtur sensum detinet oculorum, id est, animi intentio. De Trinitate, lib. 11. cap. 2. vol. 3. p. 379.

“ image, likeness, and pattern of the holy  
 “ trinity \*.” Even the Platonists had gone  
 before the orthodox in supposing that there  
 was something in the constitution of the  
 mind of man, corresponding to the three  
 great principles in nature. This is strongly  
 expressed by Plotinus†.

Of such illustrations as these, the writings of Austin particularly contain a great variety ; but he was preceded in them by his master Ambrose, and also by another writer, whose work has been ascribed to Athanasius ; who says, “ man, viz. the soul  
 “ of man, is the image of God ; but the  
 “ soul of man, being one, has three hy-  
 “ postases, and three persons. How ?  
 “ Hear. The soul is one person, but the soul  
 “ generates *logos*, i. e. *reason*, and now the

\* Διὰ γὰρ ταύτην καὶ μόνον τὴν αἰλίαν τοῦτον ζῶν ὁ θεὸς κατέσκευασεν, ἐπειδὴ ἐμῆλθεν ἐν κόσμῳ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος μυστήριον, ὡς δις ἐκτετυπέναι τε καὶ ἀντιδοχῆσθαι • ἵνα ἔσῃ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὁ πατὴρ εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν θεῷ, τῇ εἰκόνα ὁ ὁμοίωσιν καὶ τὸς τυπὸς καὶ τὰ παραδείγματα τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος. In Gen. i. 26. Opera, vol. i. p. 863.

† Ὡς περὶ δὲ ἐν τῇ φύσει τριτὴν εἶναι τὰ εἰρημένα, εἴω χρη νόμιζειν καὶ παρ’ ἡμῶν ταῦτα εἶναι. λέγει δὲ ἐκ ἐν τοῖς ἀσκήλοις. En. 5. lib. i. cap. 10. p. 491.

“ reason

“ reason is another person. The soul emits  
 “ the breath” (or spirit) “ and behold the  
 “ spirit is another person. Behold then  
 “ three persons, the *soul*, *reason*, and *spirit*\*.”  
 On this very curious illustration, no particular remarks will be expected.

Ambrose makes the *intellect*, the *will*, and  
 “ the *memory*, emblems of the trinity; and  
 says, “ The intellect is the soul, the will is  
 “ the soul, and the memory is the soul;  
 “ and yet there are not three souls in  
 “ one body, but one soul, having three dig-  
 “ nities, or attributes.” He says farther,  
 “ as the Son is generated out of the Father,  
 “ and the Spirit proceeds from the Father  
 “ and the Son, so the will is generated out  
 “ of the intellect, as is easily understood by  
 “ those who have knowledge†.”

\* Ἰδὲ λοιπόν, ὁ ἀνθρώπος εἰκὼν ἐστὶ τὰ θεῶν, ἡ γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ τὰ ἀνθρώ-  
 πων. ἐνὶ δὲ ἡ ψυχὴ τὰ ἀνθρώπων μία μὲν, τριφυτοῦστος δὲ. τρία προ-  
 σωπα εἷχει ἡ ψυχὴ. καὶ πῶς, ἀκέραιον. εἷστιν ἡ ψυχὴ ἐν προσωπῶν. ἡ  
 δὲ ψυχὴ γεννᾷ τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἰδὲ ὁ λόγος ἄλλο προσωπῶν. ἡ ψυχὴ ἐκ-  
 πορεύει καὶ τὴν ὥσων, καὶ ἰδὲ ἡ ὥσων ἄλλο προσωπῶν. ἰδὲ προσωπα  
 τρία, ψυχὴ, λόγος, καὶ ὥσων. Opera, vol. 2. p. 439.

† Ita et anima intellectus, anima voluntas, anima me-  
 moria : non tamen tres animæ in uno corpore sed una ani-

But Austin has discovered the most ingenuity in his illustrations of the trinity, drawn from the consideration of the faculties of the mind. He says, that “ *memory*, “ *intellect*, and *love*, are an image of the “ trinity\*.” But he acknowledges that this is not a perfect resemblance, as all images are imperfect. He compares “ the joint “ operation of the Father, Son, and Spirit “ to the joint exertion of the intellect,

ma tres habens dignitates. Nam sicut ex patre generatur filius, et ex patre filioque procedit spiritus sanctus : ita ex intellectu generatur voluntas, et ex his item ambobus procedit memoria, sicut facile a sapiente quolibet intelligi potest De Dignitate, &c. Opera, vol. I. p. 106.

\* Ego per omnia tria illa memini, ego intelligo, ego diligo, qui nec memoria sum, nec intelligentia, nec dilectio, sed hæc habeo. Ista ergo dici possunt ab una persona, quæ habet hæc tria, non ipsa est hæc tria. In illius vero summæ simplicitate naturæ quæ Deus est, quamvis unus sit Deus, tres tamen personæ sunt, pater et filius et spiritus sanctus. Aliud est itaque trinitas res ipsa, aliud imago trinitatis in re alia, propter quam imaginem simul et illud in quo sunt hæc tria, imago dicitur : sicut imago dicitur simul et tabula et quod in ea pictum est ; sed propter picturam quæ in ea est, simul et tabula nomine imaginis appellatur. De Trinitate, lib. 15. cap. 22. Op. vol. 3. p. 469.

“ memory

“ memory, and will of man, each of them  
 “ being employed in the acts of each.” So  
 he says, “ the whole trinity operates in the  
 “ voice from the Father, the flesh of the  
 “ Son, and the dove of the Holy Spirit,  
 “ though they are separately referred to  
 “ each of them\*.” He also compares the  
 trinity to the *mind*, its *knowledge*, and its  
*love* †.” Again, he says, “ *to be, to know,*  
 “ and *to will*, are properties that mutually  
 “ involve each other ; and yet belong to one  
 “ soul ;” and this he gives as an illustration  
 of the trinity ‡.

Manuel Caleca says it would be more  
 proper to denominate the three persons  
 from the nature of the soul, *mind, reason,*

\* Et quemadmodum cum memoriam meam et intellec-  
 tum et voluntatem nomino, singula quidem nomina ad  
 res singulas referunt, sed tamen ab omnibus tribus singulis  
 facta sunt : nullum enim horum trium nominum est, quod  
 non et memoria et intellectus et voluntas mea simul ope-  
 rata sint : ita trinitas simul operata est et vocem patris, et  
 carnem filii, et columbam spiritus sancti, cum ad singulas  
 personas hæc singula referant. De Trinitate, lib. 4.  
 cap. 20. Opera, vol. 3. p. 314.

† Ibid. lib. 9. cap. 3. p. 360.

‡ Dico autem hæc tria, esse, nosse, velle. Confess. lib.  
 13. cap. 11. Opera, vol. 1. p. 219.

and love, than from the body, by the names of Father, Son, and Spirit\*.”

Gregory Nazianzen thought that the *soul*, its *intellect*, and its *desire*, were an emblem of the trinity, as not being divided from each other†.” He also compares the trinity to the νοῦς, intellect, λογος, reason, and πνευμα, spirit, of man; but acknowledges that it is imperfect‡.”

According to Methodius, quoted by Gregory Nyssen, “the *soul*, the *mind*, and “the *spirit* of a man, are emblems of the “trinity; the soul which is unbegotten, “representing the Father, the mind, or “logos, which is *generated*, the Son, and

\* Ωςτε απο της ψυχης την εικονα λαμβανοντες, οικειοτερος προσερεμεν τον θεον νυν, κ̅ λογον, κ̅ αγαπην, η απο τ̅ σωματιου πατερα, κ̅ υιον, κ̅ πνευμα, αυτον ονομαζοντες. De Principiis, in Combefis, vol. 2. p. 233.

† Ουτω μοι νοει και τον υιον τ̅ πατρος μη χωρισθεντα πωποτε, κ̅ τ̅ς δε παλιν το πνευμα το αγιον, ομοιως εν τω νω την ενδυμησιν. ως γαρ η̅ εστι μελαξυ νε και ενδυμησεως και ψυχης διαιρεσιν επινοηθηναι τινα και του ην, εως εδε τ̅ αγιου πνευματος και τ̅ σωτηρος και τ̅ πατρος, εν μεσω τομην ι διαιρεσιν επινοηθηναι ποτε. Or. 45. p. 719.

‡ Αυτοι δε μιαν και την αυτην ειδεναι φυσιν θεοτης, αναρχω, και γεννησει, κ̅ προσδ. γνωριζομεν. ν. ως νω τω εν ημιν. και λογω και πνευματι, εσον εικασαι τοις αιδηλοις τα νοητα, και τοις μικροις τα μεγαλα. Or. 13. p. 211.

“ the

“ the spirit, or breath, which *proceedeth*,  
 “ the Holy Spirit; and there is this far-  
 “ ther analogy, that the logos is two-  
 “ fold, internal and external, which corre-  
 “ sponds to the two-fold nature of Christ\*.”  
 “ The soul,” says this writer again, “ has  
 “ three powers, the *rational, irascible*, and  
 “ *concupiscible* faculties, another emblem of  
 “ the trinity.†”

\* Ἀλλὰ γε ὁ ἐπὶ αὐτῷ τοῦ καὶ ρηθέντος τε καὶ εἰκονα καὶ καθ' ὁμοιω-  
 σιν ἐλθωμεν, ὅπως καὶ τὰς ὑποσχεσεις δεῖξωμεν τοῦ μοναδικοῦ τῆς ἐν  
 τριάδι θεοῦ. ποῖον δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ; εὐδὴλον ὅτι ἡ ἡμέτερα παλιν ψυχὴ,  
 καὶ ὁ ταύτης νοερός λογος καὶ ὁ νῆς οὕτως ὁ ἀποστολος πνεῦμα πρῶτη-  
 γορευσεν, ὅτε διακελευεῖται ἅγιος ἡμᾶς εἶναι τῇ ψυχῇ, καὶ τῷ σώματι, καὶ  
 τῷ πνεύματι. Ἀγεννητός μὲν γὰρ παλιν ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ ἀνάκλητος, εἰς  
 τυπὸν ἀγεννητῆς καὶ τῆς ἀνακλήσεως θεοῦ καὶ πατρός • ἐκ ἀγεννητοῦ δὲ ὁ νοερός  
 αὐτῆς λογος, ἀλλ' ἐξ αὐτῆς γεννωμενος ἀρετήως, καὶ ἀοράτως καὶ ἀνερμη-  
 νεύτως, καὶ ἀπαθῶς.

Το δὲ παραδοξότερον τῶν παραδοξῶν τῶν ἐκείνου ἐστίν, ὅτι ψυ-  
 χὴν μὲν ἀπλὴν τινὰ ἐχόμεν, ὁμοίως καὶ τὸν μοναδικὸν καὶ ἀσυνδιεῖον •  
 λόγον δὲ διπλὴν ἐχούνης, τὸν αὐτὸν τὴν γενεσὶν καὶ ἐνα καὶ ἀμερίστον  
 φυλάττομενον. In Gen. i. 26. Opera, vol. i. p. 553. §. 9.

† Ὅθεν καὶ τριμερὴς παλιν αὐτὴν τὴν ἡμέτεραν ψυχὴν κατ' εἶδρον  
 τινὰ τρόπον οἱ ἐξω σοφοὶ εἰναι ὠρισάντο, ἐπιθυμητικὸν αὐτὴν φασκόντες  
 εἶχειν καὶ λογιστικὸν καὶ θυμικόν, ὅπως δ' αὖ μὲν τὰ ἐπιθυμητικὰ πρὸς τὴν  
 τῆς θεοῦ ἀγαπὴν συναπλήναι • δια δὲ τὰ λογιστικὰ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὴν γνῶσιν  
 καὶ σοφίαν εἰσδεχέσθαι • δια δὲ τὰ θυμικὰ πρὸς τὰ πνεύματα τῆς πονη-

In all the preceding comparisons, the three persons are, in fact, *parts of one whole*, and yet this idea is reprobated by Austin, who says, “there is another heresy which  
 “ asserts that God is three-fold, that the  
 “ Father is one part, the Son another, and  
 “ the Spirit a third, that all these parts  
 “ of God make a trinity, so that none of  
 “ them are perfect of themselves \*.”

According to another set of comparisons the three persons of the trinity agree in nothing but in having *one common property*, and in that sense, three men might make a trinity; but then their *unity* is entirely abandoned. Athanasius, and many others after the council of Nice, became absolute tritheists on this principle; believing that the Father, Son, and Spirit, are no other-

γιας ἀλλοτρίαι, καὶ ἐν τοῖς πολλοῖς αὐτοῖς τοῖς τρισὶ το κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ διακρίνεται. In Gen. i. 26. Opera, vol. i. p. 859.

\* Est alia, quæ triformem sic assertit Deum, ut quædam pars ejus sit pater, quædam filius, quædam spiritus sanctus: hoc est quod Dei unius partes sint, quæ istam faciunt trinitatem, velut ex his tribus partibus compleatur Deus, nec sit perfectus in seipso, vel pater, vel filius, vel spiritus sanctus. Catalogus. Hær. Opera, vol. 6. p. 29.

wife



wife *one*, than as having one common nature. Athanasius, considering this question, says, "Since the Father is called " God the Son God, and the Holy Spirit " God; how is it that there are not three " Gods," answers, " that where there is a " common nature, the name of the dignity " is likewise common\*." He illustrates this by God's calling the whole human race, by the name of *man*, in the singular number, and by Moses speaking of the *horse* and the *horseman* being drowned in the red sea; when, in fact, great numbers of each sort were intended. " If this," says he, " be the case with respect to men, who " differ so much as they do from each " other, so that all men may be called one " man, much more may we call the tri- " nity one God; when their dignity is " undivided, they have one kingdom, one " power, will, and energy, which distin- " guishes the trinity from created things†."

\* Καὶ πῶς φησι δύνασθαι λεγέσθαι ὁ πατήρ θεός, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς θεός, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον θεός, καὶ ἔ τρεῖς εἰσι θεοί; ὅτε κοινὰ τὰ τῆς φύσεως, κοινὸν καὶ ὄνομα τῆς ἀξιώσεως. De Communi Essentia, Opera, vol. 1. p. 213.

† Διὰ τὸ κοινὸν τῆς φύσεως πάντα ἡ οἰκουμενὴ εἰς ἀνδρωπότη ἐκλήθη· ὅτε δὲ ἀμερίστος ἡ ἀξία, μία βασιλεία, μία δύνα-

In the dialogue against the Macedonians, written after the age of Athanasius, the orthodox speaker is represented as saying, “As Paul, Peter, and Timothy are of one nature, and three hypostases, so I say the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three hypostases, and one nature \*.”

In the following illustration of this comparison, it will clearly appear, that all idea of a proper *unity* in the trinity was abandoned; since the three persons were only considered as having the common property of *divinity*, just as three men have the common property of *humanity*. “Peter, Paul, and Timothy, are three, but not three men,” says Theodoret, “because they must then have been discordant to each other, as Jew, Gentile, and christian; but if they say the same thing, and there be no division among them, they are three hypostases, but one in the Lord; because they have one heart and one soul.

μὴ καὶ βολὴ καὶ ἐνεργεία, ἰδιόζεστα τὴν τριάδα ἀπο τῆς κτίσεως, εἰς λέγω θεόν. De comm. Effen. Op. vol. 1 p. 214.

\* Ὡς τὸν παυλόν, καὶ πέτρον, καὶ τιμόθεον, φύσεως μίαν εἰσι καὶ τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις, ὅπως πατέρα, καὶ υἱόν, καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τρεῖς ὑπὸστάσεις λέγον, καὶ μίαν φύσιν. Opera, vol. 2. p. 269.

“They

“ They are three in number, but not on account of a diversity of nature, or heart\*.”

When the trinity was compared to Peter, James, and John, and it was observed that they were three distinct men, Gregory Nyssen replies, “ first, that though this be the case with *men*, it is not so with *God*.” He afterwards says, that “ the term is improper, and that it is an abuse of language in this case to say *three men*, for that it is the same thing as saying there are three human natures †.” He also says, that

\* Οὐκ εἰς ἐν εἰσι τρεῖς Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος, καὶ Τιμόθεος· Ο. τρεῖς μὲν εἰσι ἀλλ’ ἢ τρεῖς ἀνθρώποι. Α. Πας; Ο. ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσὶν ἀνθρώποι ὅταν ἀνομοίαν ἐχῶσιν τὴν καρδίαν, ὡς Ἑλλήν, καὶ Ἰουδαῖον, καὶ Χριστιανόν· ὅταν δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ λεγῶσιν καὶ μὴ εἰν ἐν αὐτοῖς χισμάτα, τρεῖς μὲν εἰσὶν ὑποστάσεις εἰς δὲ ἐν κυρίῳ, μίαν ψυχὴν ἐχούσας καὶ μίαν καρδίαν· καὶ τρεῖς μὲν εἰσὶν ἀριθμῶ, ἀλλ’ ἢ ἐξ ἐξομολογίας φύσεως, ἢ καρδίας. Ad. Anomæos, Opera, vol. 5. p. 275.

† Τίδη ποτε τοίνυν ἐν τῇ καθήμας συνθεῖα καθένα τοὺς ἐν τῇ φύσει τῇ αὐτῇ δεικνόμενους ἀπαριθμήσαντες πληθυντικῶς ὀνομαζόμεν, τοσούτους λεγούσας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ οὐχι εἰς τοὺς πάντας, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς θείας φύσεως ἐκβάλλει τὸ πληθὺς τῶν θεῶν ὅτε δογματικὸς λόγος, καὶ ἀριθμῶν τὰς ὑποστάσεις, καὶ τὴν πληθυντικὴν σημασίαν ἢ προσδεχομενός.—Φάμεν τοίνυν πρῶτον κατὰ χρῆσιν τίνα συνθεῖας εἶναι τὸ τῆς θείης μερὸς ἐν τῇ φύσει κατ’ αὐτὸ τὸ τῆς φύσεως ὄνομα πληθυντικῶς ὀνομαζέειν, καὶ λέγειν, ὅτι πολλοὶ ἀνθρώποι· ὡς ομοίον ἐστὶ το λέγειν, ὅτι πολλὰ φύσεις ἀνθρώπων. Opera, vol. 2. p. 449.

“ though

“ though the men are three, the Father,  
 “ Son, and Spirit are not, because all their  
 “ actions are joint, and none of them does  
 “ any thing separately \*.” “ With respect  
 “ to men,” he says, “ there is no danger of  
 “ being led into any mistake, as if more  
 “ human natures were intended; but the  
 “ language of scripture is more exact with  
 “ respect to God, lest more divine natures  
 “ should be understood, and therefore we  
 “ are told, that there is but one God †.”

This writer expresses himself more concisely, and to the purpose, when he says,  
 “ they are not *three*, because there is *one di-*  
 “ *vinty* ‡.” And also Basil, when he says,

\* *Επι δε της θείας φύσεως, ὡς ἕως ἐμαθομεν, ὅτι ὁ πατήρ ποιεῖ τι καθ' ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ μὴ συναρπάζεται υἱός. ἢ πάλιν υἱὸς ἰδιωζόντως ἐνεργεῖ τι χωρὶς τοῦ πνεύματος.* Ibid. p. 455.

† *Δια τοῦτο ἀνθρώπους συγχωρεῖ πληθυντικῶς ὀνομαζεῖν, δια το μὴ εἶναι τῷ τοιούτῳ σχήματι τῆς φωνῆς εἰς πλῆθος ἀνθρώπων τῶνταῖς υποκοίσις ἐκτιπτεῖν, μὴδὲ νομίζειν πολλὰς ἀνθρωπίνων φύσεως σημαίνεσθαι, δια το πληθυντικῶς ἐξαγγέλλεσθαι το τῆς φύσεως ὄνομα. το δὲ θεὸς φωνὴν παρατετηρημέναν κατὰ τὸν ἐνικὸν ἐξαγγέλλει τυπὸν, τοῦτο προμηθεύμεν, το μὴ διαφορὰς φύσεις ἐπὶ τῆς θείας ἑσίας ἐν τῇ πληθυντικῇ σημασίᾳ τῶν θεῶν παρεισαγεσθαι. διὸ, φησὶ, κύριος ὁ θεός, κύριος εἷς ἐστίν.* Ibid. p. 458.

‡ *Δια τί ἐν ἑτρείς; ὅτι μία θεότης* Or. i. Opera, vol. i. p. 141.

“ to

“ to those who accuse us of making three  
 “ Gods, we answer, that we acknowledge  
 “ one God, not in number, but in na-  
 “ ture\*.” It is very extraordinary, that men  
 should express themselves in this manner,  
 and yet imagine that they were not tritheists.  
 This writer also says, “ a king and his  
 “ image do not make two kings †.” But  
 then the image of a king is not a king,  
 though he would maintain that Christ, the  
 image of God, was himself God.

Cyril of Jerusaleim varies this compari-  
 son, when he says, “ the Father resembles a  
 “ king, who has a son, who is a king also,  
 “ and who gives his orders to be executed  
 “ by his son ‡ ;” but here unhappily there  
 are two kings, and not one.

\* Προς δε τας επιηρεζοντας ημας το τριθεον, εκεινο λεγε-  
 σθω οτι περ ημεις εναθεον, & τω αριθμω, αλλα τη φύσει ομο-  
 λογουμεν. Epist. 141. Opera, vol. 3. p. 164.

† Ουδε γαρ ο κατὰ την αγοραν τη βασιλικη εικονι ενατε-  
 νιζον, και βασιλεα λεγων τον εν τω πιακι, δυο βασιλεας  
 ομολογει, την τε εικονα, και τον & εστιν η εικων. Hom. 27.  
 Opera, vol. 1. p. 522.

‡ Ωσπερ γαρ α τις βασιλευς, βασιλευν εχων, βελομεν-  
 κατασκευαται πολιν, υποθαιτο τω νυν συμβασιλευοντι την κα-  
 τασκευην της πολεως. Cat. 11. Opera, p. 146.

Austin, who by no means keeps to one explanation of a thing, on one occasion extricates himself from the great difficulty of making three gods in a very curious manner: He says, that, “in saying the Holy Spirit is God, or the Son of God is God, and the Father God, I say *God three times*, but I do not say *three Gods*; for *three times God* is more than *three Gods* \*.”

The different origins of the three persons in the trinity were thought to be illustrated by the case of Adam, Eve, and their son, in the following ingenious manner, by Methodius, as it is given by Gregory Nyssen: “Adam, his son, and Eve,” he says, “were types of the trinity; Adam of the Father, who was without cause, or unbegotten; his son of Christ, who was begotten; and Eve, who issued from Adam, of the

\* Spiritus enim sanctus Deus, sicut dei filius Deus, et pater Deus. Ter dixi Deus, sed non dixi tres Deos, magis enim Deus ter quam dii tres. Expositiones in John, Tr. 6. Opera, vol. 9. p. 49.—Something seems to be omitted after *magis* (*more*), perhaps he meant *more safe*, or *more pious*. Had he attended to his arithmetic, he would have found, that there is no difference between *three times one* and *three*.

“ Holy

“ Holy Spirit, who was not begotten, but  
 “ proceeded. For this reason,” he says, “ God  
 “ did not breathe into her the breath of life,  
 “ because she was to be a type of the Holy  
 “ Spirit \*.”

He adds, “ If this was not intended to be  
 “ a type of the trinity, why were not three  
 “ or four progenitors made, each having  
 “ their several properties? Whereas here  
 “ being an *unbegotten*, a *begotten*, and one  
 “ that *proceeded*, they make an exact type of  
 “ the trinity †.”

Similar to the illustrations of the trinity  
 from the sub-divisions of the mind of man,

\* Τὸ μὲν ἀναίτιον καὶ ἀγεννήτως Ἀδάμ τυπὸν καὶ εἰκόνα ἐχούσης τὴν  
 ἀνάληξιν καὶ πάντων αἰτίαν πνευματικὸς θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ· τὴν δὲ γεννήτως υἱὸν  
 αὐτῆς εἰκόνα προδιαγραφούσης, τὴν γεννήτως υἱὸν καὶ λόγον τὴν θεὸν· τῆς δὲ ἐκ-  
 πορεύσεως ἑνὸς σημαίνουσας τὴν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐκπορεύσιν ὑποσάσιν·  
 διὸ καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν αὐτῇ ὁ θεὸς πνοὴν ζωῆς, διὰ τὸ τυπὸν αὐτὴν εἶναι τῆς  
 τῆς ἁγίας πνεύματος πνοῆς καὶ ζωῆς, καὶ διὰ τὸ μέλλειν αὐτὴν διὰ ἁγίου πνευ-  
 μάτος δεῖξασθαι θεὸν τὸν οὐτως οὐτὰ πάντα πνοὴν καὶ ζωὴν. In Gen. 1.  
 26. Opera, vol. 1. p. 856.

† Εἰ δὲ μὴ εἶδον μὴδὲ κατὰ τὸ κατ’ εἰκόνα, τί δή ποτε μὴ τεσ-  
 σάρεις, ἢ δύο, ἢ πλείονες ὑποστάσεις τῶν προπατέρων γεγονασί, πα-  
 ρηλαγμένας εἶχασαι τὰς υποστάσεις αὐτῶν ιδιότητος; λέγω δὲ τὸ ἀγεν-  
 νῆτον καὶ τὸ γεννητόν, καὶ τὸ ἐκπορεύον, ἀλλὰ τρεῖς καὶ μονάς, ἔκταν εἰς  
 κατ’ εἰκόνα καὶ κατ’ ὁμοίωσιν τυπικὴν τριάδα, ἐν μονάδι ἐν τρισὶν  
 ὑποστάσεσιν, ἀκαλεθὸν σε λοιπὸν μαθεῖν καὶ μονάδα ἐν τριάδι. Ibid.

are those more ancient ones of the fountain, the river, and a draught of water; and that of the root, the stock, and the branch, which are adopted with variations by Austin. But these all represent *parts of one whole*, or rather they are things that agree in one common property; and in this very circumstance it is, that Austin makes the resemblance to consist; for, concerning the former he says, “they are all water,” and concerning the latter, “they are all wood \*.”

After such a trinity as this, can we wonder that some should be acknowledged by their friends to carry their orthodoxy into absolute *tritheism*. “There are three distinct orders,” says Gregory Nazianzen, “with respect to theology with us; one of Atheism, another Judaism, and a third tritheism. Of the latter,” he says, “those are guilty who are too orthodox among

\* Cum illa regula nominis maneat, utradix lignum sit, et robur lignum, et rami lignum, non tum tria ligna dicantur, sed unum.—Illud certe omnes concedunt si ex fonte tria pocula impleantur posse dici tria pocula, tres autem aquas non posse dici, sed omnino unam aquam. De Fid. Opera, vol. 3. p. 146.



“us\*.” Or can any person be surprized at the rise of a sect of tritheists, of whom we have an account in ecclesiastical history†.

After the exhibition of so many wretched explications and illustrations of the trinity, one cannot help approving the wisdom of those Fathers who were occasionally sensible of their imperfection, and therefore acquiesced in the doctrine, as expressed in the usual phraseology, without pretending to understand it at all. Thus a writer, whose work has been ascribed to Athanasius, says, “the trinity is an inexplicable  
“mystery,” not to be enquired into‡. Basil also says, that “the mysteries of theology require to be assented to, without  
“previous reasoning§.” “Let no one,” says Gregory Nyssen, “insult us, because  
“we are not able to produce from all na-

\* Τριων γαρ οντων των νυν περι την θεολογιαν αβρωσημάτων Αθειας κ' Ιεδαισμού κ' πολυθειας.—Της δε τινος των αγων παρ ημιν ορθοδοξων. Or. I. Opera, p. 16.

† See Nicephori Hist. lib. 18. cap. 16. vol. 2. p. 872.

‡ Αβρηλον κ' ανεκφραστον το της αγιας τριαδος υπαρχει μυστηριον. Opera, vol. 2. p. 232.

§ Ουτω δη εν κ' το της θεολογιας μυστηριον, την εκ της αδαιτανισεωσις επιζηλει συγκληθεσθαι. In Pl. 115. Opera, vol. 1. p. 270.

“ture a perfect image of the trinity\*.” Cassian says, “it is God’s part to know, “ours to believe†.” And Julianus Pomerius, Archbishop of Toledo, says, “that all “the labour of human disputation is to be “set aside, where faith alone is sufficient‡.”

This being the case, it certainly would have been much wiser in these writers not to have attempted to explain what, in its own nature, was incapable of being explained; as all their attempts could only tend to expose it, and them, to ridicule. It was alledged however, that though the doctrine of the trinity be mysterious and incomprehensible, there are likewise many things inexplicable to us in nature. In answer to those who objected to the mystery of the trinity, Gregory Nazianzen says,

\* Μηδεις δε επηρ' εβειν τω λογω μη δυναμενω τοιαυτην εν τοις εσιν ευρειν εικονα τε ζητιμενα. η δα παντων αρησσει δι' αναλογιας τινος κ' ομοιωθης προς την τε προκειμενη αναγωγην. *Contra Eunomium*, Or. 7. Opera, vol. 2. p. 206.

† Nostrium namque est credere illius nosse. *De Incarnatione*, lib. 1. cap. 5. p. 970.

‡ Postponenda enim est omnis humanæ disputationis industria, ubi fides sufficiat sola. *Contra Judæos*, lib. 2. Bib. Pat. vol. 5. p. 223.

there

there are mysteries in all nature, and in the mind of man. “If,” says he, “you who  
 “enquire concerning these things do not  
 “understand yourself, if you do not un-  
 “derstand those things which you can ex-  
 “amine with your senses, how can you  
 “understand God, what and how great he  
 “is? This is great folly\*.”

The authority of the church was also had recourse to, as an argument to enforce the reception of what could not be proved or explained. “Some tenets in the church,” says Basil, “we receive as preserved in  
 “writing, but some are of apostolical tra-  
 “dition, handed down as *mysteries*, both  
 “of which have the same force with re-  
 “spect to piety, and no one will question  
 “them, who is at all acquainted with the  
 “laws of the church†.”

\* Εἰ σαυτὸν οὐκ ἐγνων, ὅς τις εἶ, ὁ περὶ τῶν διαλεγόμενων, εἰ ταυτὰ  
 καὶ ἐλεάσεις. ὧν καὶ ἡ αἰσθησις μακρὺς, πῶς θεὸν ἀκριβῶς, ὅπερ τε καὶ ὅσον  
 εἶναι, εἶδέναι ὑπολαμβάνεις; πολλῆς τῆς αἰλογίας. Or. 29.  
 Opera. p. 493.

† Τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πεφυλαγμένων δογμάτων καὶ κερυγμάτων, τα-  
 μὲν ἐκ τῆς ἐγγραφῆς διδασκαλίας ἐχομεν, τα δὲ ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων  
 παραδόσεως, διαδοθέντα ἡμῖν ἐν μυστηρίῳ παραδεξαμεθα· ἀπερ ἀμφοτέρω  
 τὴν αὐτὴν ἰσχυὴν ἔχει πρὸς τὴν εὐσεβείαν· καὶ τοῖς ὁδοῦν ἀνιέρει ὅς τις

Austin pleaded for implicit faith by the authority of the prophet Isaiah. “It was “therefore,” he says, “rationally said by “the prophet (chap. vi.) unless ye believe, “ye will not understand; where he doubt- “less distinguishes these two things, and “advises that we first believe that we may “be able to understand what we believe; “so that it seems reasonable that faith “should precede reason\*.”

The Fathers having meditated so much on the number *three*, it is no wonder that they should have got a kind of fondness for it, and have thought that there was something very wonderful in it. Epiphanius has taken pains to collect all the instances of this sacred number from the scriptures, and he makes above one hundred of them†.

γε καὶ πολλὰ μικρὸν γὰρ δεσμῶν ἐπαλησιάζουσιν πεπειραμένοι. De Sp. S. cap. 27. Opera, vol. 2. p. 351.

\* Et ideo rationabiliter dictum est per prophetam : nisi credideritis, non intelligetis. Ubi proculdubio discrevit hæc duo, deditque consilium quo prius credamus, ut id quod credimus intelligere valeamus. Proinde ut fides precedat rationem, rationabiliter visum est. Epist. 222. Opera, vol. 2. p. 859.

† De Nummorum Mysteriis, Opera, vol. 2. p. 304.

Austin

Austin having mentioned twelve attributes of God, reduces them all to three, viz. *eternity, wisdom, and happiness*. “These three,” he says, “are a trinity, which we call God; and, perhaps, in the same manner in which we reduce the twelve attributes to these three, the three may be reduced into any one of them. For if, in the divine nature, wisdom and power be the same thing, or life and wisdom, why may not eternity and wisdom, or happiness and wisdom, be the same thing\*.” I need not repeat upon this occasion, what I have before observed concerning the metaphysics of the ancients; and those of the philosophers were no better than those of the Fathers.

† Nunc igitur cum dicimus, æternus, sapiens, beatus, hæc tria sunt trinitas, quæ appellatur Deus: redegimus quidem illa duodecim in istam paucitatem trium, sed eo modo forsitan possumus et hæc tria in unum aliquod horum. Nam si una eademque res in Dei natura potest esse sapientia et potentia, aut vita et sapientia, cur non una eademque res esse possit in Dei natura, æternitas et sapientia, aut beatitudo et sapientia. De Trinitate, lib. 15. cap. 6. Opera, vol. 3 p. 446.

Austin, after considering the properties of the number *three*, seems to have thought that of itself it afforded a proof of the doctrine of the trinity\*.

Even the number *six* was thought deserving of some particular notice, because it was the double of the sacred number *three*. Epiphanius says, the number *six* is also sacred, because it is *twice three*†; and Austin treats of the perfection of the number *six*‡. “*One, two, and three,*” he says, “make *six*; and, on account of the “perfection of this number, God made all “things in six days. Wherefore the three “parts of this number *six* demonstrate to “us that God, the trinity, made all things “in the trinity of *number, measure, and “weight*§.”

\* Divisio trium in ter unum est. Quid autem aliud hic numerus ostendit; nisi trinitatem, quæ Deus est. Vol. 4. p. 68.

† Opera, vol. 2. p. 307.

‡ De Civitate Dei, lib. 15. cap. 30.

§ Unum, et duo, et tria, sex faciunt. Ideoque propter hujus numeri perfectionem sex diebus operatus est omnem creaturam. Tres ergo hæ partes senarii numeri demonstrant

But, perhaps, the most curious circumstance relating to the number *three*, that the reading of these Fathers can furnish, is the following, which was thought worthy of being recorded by Austin. “One Father Valerius,” he says, “thought that it was particularly ordered by Providence, that the word *salus*,” which signifies *health*, or *salvation*, in Latin, “in the language of the Carthaginians” (which was of Phœnician origin) “should signify *three*, or the mystery of the trinity\*.” In Hebrew, *שלוש* is *three*, which is one proof, among many others, of the derivation of the Carthaginians from the Phœnicians.

frant nobis trinitatem Deum, in trinitate numeri mensuræ et ponderis, fecisse omnem creaturam. Questiones, 65. Opera, vol. 4. p. 684.

\* Quod pater Valerius animadvertit admiras. In quorundam rusticanorum colloquutione cum alter alteri dixisset, *salus*, quæsit ab eo qui et Latine nosset et punice, quid esset *salus*: responsum est, *tria*. tum ille agnoscens cum gaudio salutem nostram esse trinitatem, convenientiam linguarum non fortuitu sic sonuisse arbitratus est, sed occultissima dispensatione divinæ providentiæ: ut cum Latine nominant *salus*, a punicis intelligant, *tria*: et cum punici lingua sua *tria* nominant, Latine intelligant, *salus*. Ad. Rom. Opera, vol. 4. p. 1181.

## CHAPTER XI.

*Of the Arguments by which the Doctrine of the Trinity was defended.*

## SECTION I.

*Arguments from the Old Testament.*

HAVING given a view of the doctrine of the trinity in all its variations, with the several *illustrations* of it, I shall now proceed to shew in what manner it was *defended* by its ancient advocates; and it is easy to imagine that all their arguments must be drawn from the *scriptures*, as it was always acknowledged that *nature* teaches no such doctrine, though it had been imagined that it was capable of being illustrated by some natural objects. These arguments from scripture I shall arrange according to the order of the books from which they are drawn.

It will be thought extraordinary, that the very first verse in the book of Genesis, which



which asserts the creation of all things by one God, should, notwithstanding this, have been imagined to teach the doctrine of the divinity of Christ. But it arose from this circumstance. Among other synonyms of the divine *nous*, or *logos*, *αρχη* (*principle*) as has been observed, was one; being taken from one of the Platonic principles of things; and this having being interpreted to signify *Christ*, wherever that word is used in the Greek translation of the Old Testament, several of the Fathers thought that they had a right to suppose that Christ was intended. Since, therefore, Moses says that *in the beginning* (*εν αρχη*) *God created the heaven and the earth*, they thought it was the same as if it had been said, that God, *in Christ*, or *by Christ*, made the heavens and the earth. Theophilus says, that *in the αρχη* means *by the αρχη*, i. e. as an instrument\*.

“In the *principium*, that is, *in Christ*,” says Ambrose, “God made the heaven and the

\* *Εν αρχη εποικησεν ο θεος τον ορανον, τελεσι δια της αρχης γεγεννησθαι τον ορανον.* Ad. Autolycum, lib. 2. p. 97.

“earth.”

“earth\*.” “What *principium*,” says Austin, “can we understand but the Son, “for he himself answered the Jews, who “questioned him concerning himself, the “*principium* who speaks to you†.” We render that passage, *the same that I said unto you from the beginning.*

As a proof that Moses was not ignorant that the world was made by the living and substantial word of God, Cyril of Alexandria alledges God’s saying, *Let there be light, and there was light, &c.†*”

\* In hoc ergo principio, id est in Christo, fecit Deus coelum et terram. Hexameron, lib. 1. Opera, vol. 1. p. 6.

† Quid aut principium intelligendum putabimus, nisi filium? Ipse enim de se ipso interrogantibus Judæis quis esset, respondit: principium qui et loquor vobis. 65. Quest. Opera, vol. 4. p. 675. 682.

‡ Εἶνα γὰρ καὶ αὐτός τον φύσει τε καὶ ἀληθῶς διακηρυττεῖ θεον, ἐκ γνησιῶς τον διὰ τὰ πάντα παρηκλῖαι πρὸς γενεσιν, τον ζῶντα τε φημι καὶ εὐποσταῖον λόγον αὐτῆς, καὶ το ἐν θεῷ τε καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ζωοποιον, το δι υἱκ, τῇ κησει πεμπομενον. εφη γὰρ ὅτι ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεος τον κρανον καὶ την γην, κεφαλαιωδέτερον δὲ, καὶ ὡς ἐν βραχεὶ τῷ λόγῳ γενεσιουργὸν των ὁλων ἀποφνας αὐτον ἐπεξεργαζέται το διηγημα, καὶ δεδειχεν ὅτι διὰ ζῶντος λόγου τε κρατύνῃ τῶν πάντων θεῷ, παρηχθη πρὸς υπαρχῆν τα καὶ οὐκ οὐκ αὐτῆς, ζωογονεῖται δὲ καὶ ἐν πνευμαλί. εἶπε φησιν ὁ θεος, γνηθήτω φῶς, καὶ ἐγενέτο φῶς, γνηθήτω πνεῦμα ἐν μεσῷ τῶν ὁδῶν.

This passage, one would rather think, was a proof that the world was made not by a *substantial* or *personified word*, but by the *simple word*, or mere *power* of God. But in the age of Cyril, the term *word*, or whatever implied *word*, suggested the idea of the living and substantial *logos*.

Tertullian expresses his dislike of this interpretation, and says that *principium* in this place, is synonymous to *initium*, *beginning* \*. Jerom also shews the same good sense upon this occasion, saying that “ac-  
“ cording to both the Greek and the He-  
“ brew, it ought to be rendered *in the be-  
“ ginning* †.”

τος, καὶ ἐγένετο ἄνω. *Contra Julianum*, lib. 1. Juliani, Op. vol. 2. p. 21.

\* Ita principium, sive initium, inceptionis esse verbum non alicujus substantiæ nomen. Nam et ipsum principium, in quo Deus fecit cœlum et terram, aliquid voluit fuisse quasi substantivum et corpulentum, quod in materiam interpretari possit. Adv. Hermogenem, S. 19. p. 240.

† In principio fecit Deus cœlum et terram plerique existimant, sicut in altercatione quoque Jasonis et papisci scriptum est et Tertullianus in lib: contra Praxeam disputat, nec non Hilarius in expositione cujusdam psalmi affirmat, in Hebræo haberi: in filio fecit Deus cœlum et terram: quod falsum esse, ipsius rei veritas comprobat, nam et septuaginta interpretes et Symmachus, et Theodotion,



says, that “ the Son is the *αρχη* and *απαρχη* of  
 “ all things, of whom we must learn the  
 “ cause, the Father of all, the most ancient,  
 “ and the benefactor of all\*.” In another  
 passage he calls Christ the *αρχη*; saying,  
 “ because the *logos* was from above, he is  
 “ and was the divine *αρχη* of all things.  
 “ This *logos*, the Christ, was the original  
 “ author of our being ; for he was in God,  
 “ and of our well being. This *logos* has  
 “ now appeared to men, he alone being both  
 “ God and man, the author of all good to  
 “ us†.”

Theophilus also speaks of the *logos*, as  
 “ having been in God, as the *αρχη*. the Spirit  
 “ of God, who spake by the prophets.

\* Το πρεσβυτερον· εν γινεσκει, την αχρενον κ̅ αναρχον αρχην τε  
 κ̅ απαρχην των ολων, τον υιον, παρ̅ υ̅ εκμαιθανειν επεκεινα  
 αιλιον, τον πατερα των ολων, το πρεσβυτερον κ̅ παλιν ευεργετικωτατον.  
 Strom.7. p. 700.

† Αλλ̅ οτι μεν ην ο λογος ανωθεν, αρχη θεια των παλιν ην τε κ̅  
 εστιν. ο̅ι δε νυν ονομα ελαβεν, το παλαι καθωστωμενον, δυναμειως αξιον  
 χριστος, καινον ασμα μοι κεκληται. ε̅λος γεν ο λογος ο χριστος, κ̅ τε  
 ειπαι παλαι ημας· ην γαρ εν θεω· κ̅ τε ευ̅ ειπαι. νυν δη επεφαιη αν-  
 θρωποις αυτος ε̅λος λογος, ο μνος αμφω, θεος τε κ̅ ανθρωπος, απαλιων  
 ημιν αιλιος αγαθων. παρ̅ υ̅ το ευ̅ η̅ν εκδιδασκομενσι, εις αιδιον ζων  
 παραπεμπομεθα. Ad. Gentes, Opera, p. 5.

“ God, therefore, having his own logos in  
 “ his own bowels, generated him with his  
 “ wisdom, throwing him out before all  
 “ things. This logos, generated by him-  
 “ self, he used as his assistant, and by him  
 “ made all things. He is called the *αρχη*,  
 “ because he rules and governs all things  
 “ that are made by him. He, therefore,  
 “ being the Spirit of God\*, and the *αρχη*,  
 “ and wisdom, and supreme power, went  
 “ into the prophets, and by them spake  
 “ concerning the maker of the world, and  
 “ all things. For there were no prophets  
 “ when the world was made, but the wis-  
 “ dom of God, which was in him, and the  
 “ holy logos, which is always with him†.”

\* It is observable, that Theophilus makes *the logos* to be the same with *the Spirit*, *πνευμα*. Eusebius also says, that *λογος* and *πνευμα* have no difference with respect to God. It is, indeed, impossible that they should have conceived any difference between them, and yet this circumstance throws great confusion into the orthodox system.

† Ερχων γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἐαυτοῦ λόγον ἐνδιαθεὶς ἐν τοῖς ἰδίαις σπλάγχνοις, ἐγέννησεν αὐτὸν μετὰ τῆς ἐαυτοῦ σοφίας ἐξερευξάμενος πρὸ τῶν ὅλων. τῶν τοῦ λόγου εἶσθεν ὑπάρχοντων τῶν ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ γεγεννημένων, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα πεποιήκειν. εἶδος λεγέσθαι ἀρχὴν, ὅτι ἀρχεῖ καὶ κυριεύει πάντων τῶν δι' αὐτοῦ ἐδημιουργημένων. εἶδος ἔν ὧν πνευμα θεὸς, καὶ ἀρχὴ καὶ σοφία, καὶ δύναμις

εἰς τὰς τρεοφίλῃς, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν εἰσαλεῖ τὰ περὶ τῆς ποιη-

However, the term *αρχη* was not so appropriated to Christ, but that it was common to all the three great *principles of things*, and of course belonged to the Father, even with respect to Christ; and therefore Cyril of Alexandria, after observing that the Father is “an eternal principle to the Son,” says, that “by *αρχη* in the introduction to the “gospel of John, the blessed evangelist “seems to signify the Father\*.”

That there was some kind of superiority in the Father in consequence of his being the original (*αρχη*) or *cause* (*αἰτιος*) was always acknowledged by the most orthodox. This is expressly asserted by Gregory Nazianzen, at the same time that he says, the Son is equal to the Father as to his *nature*. On this principle, he supposes that Christ meant to say that the Father was greater than he. “That God,” he says, “should be greater

σεως τῶ κοσμοῦ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀπαντῶν . ἔ γὰρ ἦσαν οἱ προφῆται οἱ οὗ  
κοσμος ἐγενέτο . ἀλλὰ ἡ σοφία ἡ ἐν αὐτῷ εἶσα ἡ τῶ θεοῦ , καὶ ὁ λόγος ὁ ἀγι-  
αυτεῖ ὁ αἰεὶ συμπαρων αὐτῷ . διὸ δὴ καὶ διὰ Σολομῶνος προφήτου εἶπω λέγει.  
Lib. 2. p. 82.

\* Ita æternum ei principium pater est.—Videtur igitur principii hic nomine, beatus evangelista patrem significare. In John. cap. 1. Opera, vol. 1. p. 600.

“ than

“than man, is true indeed, but no great matter. For what is there extraordinary in God being greater than a man\*.”

I now proceed to recite other arguments in support of the trinitarian doctrine, in the order of the books of scripture from which they are derived. Theophilus says, that the three days which preceded the “light,” (meaning the creation of the sun) &c. “are types of the trinity, of God, his logos, and his wisdom. The fourth,” he says, “is the type of man, who wanted light, that there might be God, logos, wisdom, man; wherefore on the fourth day lights were produced†.”

The plural number, in which God is represented as speaking, was soon laid hold of as a proof of the plurality of persons in the trinity. Tertullian says, “Does this

\* Διλον οτι το μειζον μεν εστι της αιτιας, το δε ισεν της φυσικης. κ̅ τελο υπο πολλης ευγνωμοσυνης ομολογεμεν ημεις.—Το γαρ δη λεγειν, οτι τα κα̅α των ανθρωπων νοημενα μειζων, αληθες μεν, ε̅ μεγα δε· τι γαρ θαυμαζον, ει μειζων ανθρωπος θεος. Or. 36. p. 582.

† Ωσαυτως κ̅ αι τρεις ημεραι των φωτηρων γεγονουσαι, τυποι εισιν της τριαδος, τε θεος, κ̅ τε λογος αυ̅ς, κ̅ της σοφιας αυ̅ς. τελαξη δε τυπος ειν ανθρωπος ο προσδενς τα φω̅ος, ινα η θεος, λογος, σοφια, ανθρωπος. δια τ̅ς και τη τελαξη ημεραι εγεννηθησαν φωτηρες, Lib. 2. p. 106.

“ number



“ number of trinity scandalize you, as if  
 “ they were not connected in simple unity?  
 “ I ask, how could one person only speak  
 “ in the plural number, and say, *let us*  
 “ make man in our likeness \*.” To this  
 argument Austin adds, “ Had not the three  
 “ persons been one, it would have been  
 “ said, Let us make man in our *images*, not  
 “ in our *image* †.” Basil of Sileucia has  
 the same thought ‡.

Michael Glycas, with great ingenuity,  
 discovers that all the three persons were  
 employed in the creation of man. “ Who,”  
 says he, “ said, Let us make man? The  
 “ Father. Who took the dust of the

\* Si te adhuc numerus scandalizat trinitatis, quasi non  
 connexæ in unitate simplici, interrogo quomodo unicus et  
 singularis pluraliter loquitur? Faciamus hominem ad ima-  
 ginem et similitudinem nostram. Ad Praxeam, sect. 12.  
 p. 506.

† Si vero in illis tribus personis tres essent intelligendæ  
 vel credendæ substantiæ, non diceretur ad imaginem nos-  
 trum, sed ad imagines nostras. De Fide, Ad Pel. cap. 1.  
 Opera, vol. 3. p. 211.

‡ Τριαδα μὲν ἐμφανεῖ τὴν πλᾶττεσαν, μίαν δὲ εἰκόνα τῆς τριάδος  
 ὑπαρχσαν. εἰ δὲ μία τῆς τριάδος ἡ εἰκὼν, μία τῶν τριῶν ὑποστάσεων ἡ  
 φύσις. το γὰρ ταῦτον τῆς ὁσίας ἡ τῆς εἰκόνος ἐνότης κηρυττεῖ. Or. 1.  
 Opera, p. 5.

“ground for that purpose? The Son. And  
 “who breathed into him the breath of life?  
 “The Holy Spirit\*.”

Austin's veneration for the number *six* was mentioned before. He considered the creation of the world in six days as a proof of the trinity; for *six*, says he, is *twice three* †. This will be thought sufficiently far fetched; but what then shall we say to Cyril of Alexandria, who found a representation of the trinity in the dimensions of the ark of Noah ‡.

\* Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός. ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον. καὶ λέγων ὁ θεός ἦεν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἐπλάσσε τον ἄνθρωπον. τίς ὁ εἰπων; ὁ πατήρ. καὶ τίς ὁ λέγων; ὁ υἱός. ἵνα γένῃ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἀλλότριον φανήσθαι τῆς τῆς ἀδελφῶν δὲ μιᾶς. τὴν ἐνεφύσησε, λέξιν καὶ πᾶν. θαυμασιῶς παρέρληψε. Annales, pars 1. p. 69.

† Quest. 65. Opera, vol. 4. p. 684.

‡ Aspice ergo quæso, quemadmodum in trecentis cubitis, quod arcæ longitudinem esse assignavimus, perfectio sanctæ trinitatis consecratur. Quod autem, ut formula dixerim, deitas, quæ in unitate perspicitur, perfectio sit perfectionum ex latitudine arcæ, quæ ad quinquaginta sex cubitos extendit, latissime patet. Quinquagenarius etenim numerus, septem septies diebus, unitate quoque conjuncta, conficitur. Quia unam quidem deitatis naturam esse adserimus. Altitudo etiam ipsius arcæ nil aliud profecto, quam mentem ipsam mirifice nobis suggerit. In decimum  
 enim

That it was Christ who spake to the Patriarchs, was agreed by all the Fathers from the time of Justin Martyr ; and the proof of it lay in this circumstance, that the person who *appeared* is called God ; but since the supreme God is *invisible*, there must have been another person intitled to that appellation ; as we have seen in the extracts from Justin himself. I shall in this place add some passages to this purpose from other writers.

Tertullian, having observed that God the Father is invisible, and yet that God was in some sense visible to the patriarchs, infers that it must have been the Son who appeared to them. “ He must, therefore,” he says, “ be another person who was seen. “ For he who was seen cannot be invisible. “ It therefore follows, that we suppose the “ Father to be invisible on account of the “ plenitude of his majesty, but the Son to  
 enim tertium cubitorum numerum perficitur. Triginta enim cubitorum, inquit, altitudinem ejus facies : et in cubitum unum consummabis eam. Sancta enim trinitas in tres hypostases triumque personarum differentias quum extendatur, in unam deitatis naturam quodammodo contrahitur. In Gen. 3. Opera, vol. i. p. 17.

“ be visible, as being derived from him.  
 “ As though we cannot see the sun him-  
 “ self, we can bear his beams, as a tem-  
 “ pered portion of him, extending to the  
 “ earth\*.”

“ Moses,” says Novatian, “ every where  
 “ introduces God the Father as immense,  
 “ and without end, not confined to place,  
 “ but including all space, not one who is  
 “ *in place*, but rather in whom all place is,  
 “ comprehending and embracing all things;  
 “ so that he can neither ascend nor descend.  
 “ For he contains and fills all things; and  
 “ yet he introduces a God descending to  
 “ the tower which the sons of men built†.”

\* Jam ergo alius erit qui videbatur, quia non potest idem invisibilis definiri, qui videbatur, et consequens erit, ut invisibilem patrem intelligamus, pro plenitudine majestatis; visibilem vero filium agnoscamus, pro modulo derivationis: sicut nec solem nobis contemplari licet, quantum ad ipsam substantiæ summam quæ est in cœlis; radium autem ejus toleramus oculis pro temperatura portionis quæ in terram inde porrigitur. Ad Praxeam, sect. 14. p. 508.

† Quid si idem Moyse ubique introducit deum patrem immensum atque sine fine, non qui loco cludatur, sed qui omnem locum cludat: nec eum qui in loco sit, sed potius in quo omnis locus sit: omnia continentem et cuncta complexum, ut merito nec descendat nec ascendat, quoniam  
 ipse

Austin supposed, that the three men who appeared to Abraham either were, or represented the trinity. “The two who went to Sodom must,” he says, “have been the Son and the Spirit, because they are said to have been *sent*, which the Father is never said to be \*.” As it might be objected that the Father could not become visible, he says, “Why may not the Father be understood to have appeared to Abraham and Moses, and to whom he pleased, and as he pleased, by means of a changeable and visible creature, when he in himself remained invisible and unchangeable †.”

ipse omnia et continet et implet; et tamen nihilominus introducit Deum descendentem ad turrin, quam ædificabant filii hominum. Cap. 17. p. 62.

\* Sed quas duas personas hic intelligimus, an patris et filii, an patris et spiritus sancti, an filii et spiritus sancti. Hoc forte congruentius quod ultimum dixi; missos enim se dixerunt, quod de filio et spiritu sancto dicimus. Nam patrem missum nusquam scriptura nobis notitia occurrit. De Trinitate, lib. 2. cap. 10. Opera, vol. 3. p. 272.

† Si ergo Deus pater locutus est ad primum hominem. Cur non jam ipse intelligatur apparuisse Abrahæ et Moyse et quibus voluit, et quemadmodum voluit per subiectam sibi commutabilem atque visibilem creaturam, cum ipse in seipso atque in substantia sua qua est, immutabilis atque invisibilis maneat. Ibid. p. 269.

He says, with respect to all these appearances, “ they may either be those of “ the whole trinity, which is God, or of “ each of the persons, according to the “ circumstances \*.”

Glycas says, that the trinity was received by Abraham, and cheerfully partook of the entertainment provided for them †. He adds, that, according to the opinion of Cyril, it was the Father that remained with Abraham, because he judges no man; and that they were the Son and Spirit that were

\* Jam enim quæsitum atque tractatum est, in illis antiquis corporalibus formis et visis non tantummodo patrem, nec tantummodo filium, nec tantummodo spiritum sanctum apparuisse, sed autem indifferenter dominum deum qui trinitas ipsa intelligitur, aut quamlibet ex trinitate personam, quam lectionis textus indicibus circumstantibus significaret. De Trinitate, lib. 3. cap. 1. vol. 3. p. 281.

† Και τοσόντων απλως φιλοξενος ην, ως κ' αυτην την αγιαν τριαδα καλελθειν επι της σκηνης αυτης, κ' των παραλειθεντων αυτη περιχαρως εμφερηθηναι. Δυο δε τοις Σοδομοις επεφοιτησαν. εδε γαρ ο πατηρ κρινει εδωκα. πασαν δε την κρισιν δεδωκε τω υιω, καλα την φωνην αυτε τς κυρις συνοντος φυσικως, κ' τς αγις πνευματος. Οτι δε ο υιος κ' το πνευμα επι Σοδομα επορευοντο, κ' η του Αβρααμ ξενια λαφως παριστα, καθαπερ ο μεγας φησιν Αθανασιος. ει μη γαρ ο υιος κ' το πνευμα ησαν, εκ αν τω θεω κ' πατρι συνεκαδηλο. οτι δε συνεκαδηλο, οηλον εκ τς περι τελων, ελω λεγειν. Annales, pars 2. p. 132.

sent

sent to Sodom, was the opinion of the great Athanasius, because no others could have been assessors with him.

Justin Martyr imagined, that Christ was signified by the serpent in the wilderness; and even thought that Plato had got a hint of the same thing from the scriptures, but did not rightly understand it \*."

Chrysostom finds a proof of the trinity in the blessing pronounced by Moses: *The Lord bless thee and keep thee, the Lord lift up the light of his countenance upon thee and bless thee; the Lord lift up the light of his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace.*—"Here," says he, "is the holy trinity clearly celebrated †." The foundation of this argument could only be, that God is mentioned three times in this form of benediction."

\* Οὕτως παρεδωκεν ἀναλινες Πλάτων, καὶ μὴ ἀκριβῶς ἐπισταμενός, μὴδὲ νοήσας τυπὸν εἶναι σαυρῶ, ἀλλὰ χiasμα νοήσας, τὴν μετὰ τοῦ πρώτου Θεοῦ δύναμιν κεχiasθαι ἐν τῷ παντὶ εἶπε. Apol. i. p. 87.

† Εὐλογησεὶ σε κυριος, καὶ φυλάξει σε, ἐπιφανεὶ κυριος τὸ προσωπὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σε, καὶ εὐλογησεὶ σε \* ἐπαρεὶ κυριος τὸ προσωπὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σε, καὶ δώη σοι εἰρήνην. Ὁρα τὴν ἀγίαν τριάδα διασρηδὴν αὐθυμνεμένην. Ser. 5. Opera, vol. 6. p. 73.

Eusebius says, that “ when Jacob is called the Lord’s portion, Christ is intended \*.”

If any one text be decisive in proof of there being only one God, it is that of Moses, *Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord*; and yet because the word Lord, or God, occurs three times in it, this also has been pressed into the service of the trinity. Austin, after repeating the text, says, “ in this we are not to understand the Father only, but the Father, Son, and Spirit †.”

I find no more arguments or illustrations of the doctrine of the trinity from the Old Testament, till we come to the book of

\* Τοῦτο μυστήριον το μέγιστον, πρῶτος θεολογῶν Μωσῆς ἐν ἀπορρήτοις Ἑβραϊαῖς τρεῖς πάλαι ἐμυσταγωγεί λεγών, — ὅτε διεμερίζεν ὁ υἱστος ἐθνη. — καὶ ἐγενήθη μερὶς κυρία λαὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰακώβ ——— δια τέλων γὰρ υἱσεν μὲν τὸν ἀνωτάτω, καὶ ἐπὶ πασι, θεὸν τῶν ὅλων ὀνομάζει. Κυρίῳ δὲ τὸν τέλει λόγον, τὸν δὴ καὶ δευτέρως ἡμῖν μέλα τῶν ὅλων τὸν θεὸν κυριαρχοῦμενον. Demonst. lib. 4. cap. 7. p. 156.

† Toto corde retine, patrem Deum, filium Deum, et spiritum sanctum Deum, id est sanctam atque ineffabilem trinitatem unum esse naturaliter Deum, de quo in Deuteronomio dicit: audi Israel Deus, Deus tuus, Deus unus est. Et, Deum, Deum tuum, adorabis, et illi soli servies. De Fide, ad Pat. Opera, vol. 3. p. 210.

Psalms ;



Psalms ; but here I find a great number. Jerom says, that “ the tree planted by the “ river of water, in the first psalm, is wisdom, and that wisdom is Christ \*.” Ambrose says, that “ Christ is the giant to “ run a race †.”

Some of these interpretations may be supposed to be nothing more than an allegorizing of scripture, and a play of imagination ; but when the Fathers argue from those texts in which the *logos* is mentioned, they were certainly very serious. The *logos* must be Christ. Thus Eusebius makes Christ to be the maker of the world, in Pf. xxxiii. 6.

\* *Lignum autem, cui vir beatus comparatur, sapientiam puto: de qua et Salomon loquitur: Lignum vitæ est his qui sequuntur eam. Sapientia autem per apostolum Christus Dei filius declaratur. In Pf. i. Opera, vol. 7. p. 1.*

† *Christus est Dei filius, et sempiternus ex patre, et natus ex virgine. Quem quasi gigantem sanctus David propheta describit, eo quod biformis geminæque naturæ unus sit consors divinitatis et corporis, qui tanquam sponsus procedens de thalamo suo, exultavit tanquam gigas ad currendam viam. In Pf. 19. De Incarnatione, cap. 5, Opera, vol. 4. p. 290.*

*By*

*By the word of the Lord were the heavens made* \*.

On the same principle, Ps. xlv. 1. *My heart is throwing out a good word logos*, was, by almost all the Fathers, interpreted of the eternal Father generating the Son from himself. But there is an exception in Basil, who says, that “ it refers to the prophet †.”

Eusebius also was of opinion, that it was not the Father, in Ps. xlv. 1. who was speaking of his heart throwing out the logos, but that it was the prophetic person who was speaking, because what follows does not seem to agree to the Father ‡.

\* Κχι ο Δαβιδ δὲ πον εν ψαλμωδίας εἰρω προσειπων την σοφίαν αιματι, φησι. τω λογω κυρις οι υφαντοι εσπερωδησαν, τον των απαντων δημιουργικον λογον δεξ, τειον ενευφημησας τον τροπον. Preparatio. p. 320.

† Εξ ηρωδουλο η καρδια μου λογον αγαθον. ηδη μεν τινες ωηθησαν εν προσωπιτε τς πατρος λεγεσθαι ταυτα, περι τς εν αρχη οντος προς αυτου λογου, εν ει της οινει καρδιας κ' αυλων των σπλαγχνων, φασι, προηγαγε, κ' απο αγαθης καρδιας αγαθος λογος προηλθεν. εμοι δε δοκει ταυτα επι το προφητικον αναφερεσθαι προσωπον. In Ps. 44. Opera, vol 1. p. 216.

‡ Εμοι δε δοκει ταυτα επι το προφητικον αναφερεσθαι προσωπον \* τα γαρ εφ εξης τερηβς κηβι ομοιως εξομαλιζει ημιν την περι τς πατρος εἰρησιν. Montfaucon's Collectio, vol. 1. p. 186.

In

In Ps. li. 10, 11. We read *Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence, and take not thy holy spirit from me.* “In this,” says Origen, “we have the “Father, Son, and Spirit; the Father being *the principal spirit*” (as the first verse was rendered in Greek) “the Son the right “spirit, and the Holy spirit being expressly “mentioned in the last place\*.”

Pope Gregory says, that “David taught “the Doctrine of the trinity in Ps. lxxvii. “*God be merciful to us, and bless us†.*” But this shadow of an argument can only be seen in the Latin translation, as given by himself, in which the name of God occurs three times.

\* Ο γὰρ Δαβὶδ ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ τῆς ἐξομολογήσεως περὶ τῶν τῶν πνευμάτων αἰεὶ τὸν πατέρα λεγόν. πνευματικῇ ηγεμονικῇ σφριζόν με πνεῦμα εὐδὲς ἐγκαινίσσον ἐν τοῖς ἐγγάτοις μου, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σὺ μὴ ἀντανέλης ἀπὸ ἐμοῦ, τίνα τὰ τρία πνευμάτια ταῦτα; τὸ ηγεμονικὸν ὁ πατήρ, τὸ εὐδὲς ὁ χριστός, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. In Jer. Hom. 8. Comment. vol. i. p. 95.

† David quippe ut authorem omnium Deum in trinitate ostenderet, dixit: benedicat nos Deus Deus noster, benedicat nos Deus. In Job. cap. 28. Opera, p. 174. B.

Austin

Austin proves that Christ wrought miracles before he was born of Mary, from Ps. cxxxvi. 4. "Who did them," says he, "but he of whom it is said, *who only doth great marvels* \*."

Eusebius, interpreting Ps. lvii. 3. *God sent forth his mercy and his truth*, says, "What can the *mercy* and the *truth* that is sent from God be, but the *logos* of God, concerning which it is said, *He sent forth his word and healed them, and delivered them out of their destructions*. The same is also called a *light*, and is said to be sent, in that psalm, in which it said *send forth thy light and thy truth, they shall guide me*. But the *light*, and the *truth*, and the *word*, sent from the most high God cannot want *essence* or *substance*; for a thing without substance cannot be sent. For our *logos*, consisting of syllables, and words, and names, and

† Miracula enim et nondum natus de Maria fecit. Quis enim unquam fecit, nisi ipse de quo dictum est, qui facit mirabilia magna solus? In Ps. xc. Opera, vol. 8. p. 999.

“ pronounced

“ pronounced by the tongue, and the voice,  
“ is not properly and truly *logos* \*.”

In his commentary on Ps. lxxxii. 1. he says,  
“ Left any one should be disturbed on ac-  
“ count of the *monarchy*, hearing that the  
“ Christ of God is called God, he pro-  
“ bably afterwards makes mention of *many*  
“ *Gods*, with censure, but exhorts not to  
“ decline giving the title of God to the  
“ Son of God. For if the princes of the  
“ nation, who had bad characters, were  
“ called gods, what danger can there be in  
“ calling the man who is at the right hand  
“ of God, and the Son of man who is  
“ made strong, a God †.”

† Ἐλεος δὲ καὶ ἀληθεῖα ἐξαποστελλομένη τις ἀν εἴη, ἢ οὐ τὸ θεὸς λόγος  
περὶ ὃ εἰρηγόριος· ἐξαπέτελλε τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἰασάτο αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐρρυσάτο  
αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν διαφθόρων αὐτῶν· ὁ δὲ αὐτοῦ ὁμοίως καὶ φῶς ἀποστελλομένον  
εἰρηγαίῃ ἐν τῷ φασκόντι ψαλμῷ ἐξαποστελλόν το φῶς σε καὶ τὴν ἀληθείαν  
σε, αὐτὰ με ὁδηγήσει. φῶς δὲ καὶ ἀληθεῖα καὶ λόγος ἀποστελλόμενα  
παρὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἀνεστία ὡς ἀνυπόστατα. — Οὐ γὰρ ἡμεῖς  
λόγος ὡν, συλλαβοῦς καὶ ῥημασι καὶ ὀνομασι τὴν ὑπόστασιν ἔχων, καὶ διὰ  
γλωττίης καὶ φωνῆς ἐξηχήμενος, καὶ ἀν λεχθεὶς κυρίως καὶ ἀληθῶς λόγος.  
Montfaucon's Collectio, vol. 1. p. 249.

\* Καὶ οὕτως μὴ παρεχθεὶς τις εἰς τὸν περὶ μοναρχίας λόγον, θεὸν  
ἀπὸ τῶν χριστῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰκότως καὶ πλείονας θεοὺς ὀνομαζει τῶν διὰ  
τῶν ἐξῆς κατηγορουμένων. μονοθεῖα παρὰ κελευόμενος μὴ ἀποκτείνει καὶ τοῦ  
υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ θεὸν ἀποκαλεῖν. εἰ γὰρ αἱ διαβαλλόμενα τὰ ἔθνη ἀρχόντες  
θεοὶ

Eusebius finds Christ in Pf. cvii. 20. *He sent his word and healed them\**; and in Pf. cxlvii. 15. *His word runneth very swiftly†*. Austin understood *the fountain of life*, Pf. xxxvi. 9. of the Father producing the Son who is light‡. All the Fathers understood Christ to be meant by *wisdom* in the book of Proverbs, and proved from it that he made the world ||.

There is a double reason why Christ should be intended by wisdom, Prov. viii. 22. *The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his ways*; because in the Seventy it is *the Lord created me the αρχη of his ways*. See this text quoted for this purpose, besides innumerable other places, in those cited in the margin§. The wisdom of which men-

θεοι ηξιωθησαν ονομασθηναι, ποιος αν γενοιτο κινδυνος τον ανδρα της δεξιας τε θεου και τον υιον τε ανθρωπου τον κεφαλαιωμενον θεον ομολογειν. Monfaucon's Collectio Partrum vol. I. p. 424.

\* Preparatio, p. 320.

† Ibid.

‡ De filii Divinitate, cap. 5. Opera, vol. I. p. 281.

|| Euseb. Hist. lib. I. cap. 2. p. 7. Preparatio, p. 320.

§ Origenis Comment. in John. 2. vol. I. p. 17. Euseb. Preparatio, lib. 7. cap. 12. p. 320. Ambrosii Hexameron, lib. I. Opera, vol. I. p. 6.

tion

tion is made in the book of Job, *Where is wisdom found*, &c. Job xxviii. 20. is applied to Christ by Eusebius\*.

It will make my reader smile to be informed that the *two garments*, which the good wife in the book of Proverbs, is said to have made for her husband, were thought by Ambrose to signify the divinity and humanity of Christ†.

Paulinus calls the trinity the *three-fold cord* that is not easily broken, in Eccles. iv. 12 ‡.

An argument for the divinity of Christ is brought by many of the Fathers from Is. ix. 6. where Christ is supposed to be called *the counsellor*, *the mighty God*. They always call him *the angel of the great council*, which is the version of the Seventy.

\* Preparatio, lib. 7. cap. 12. p. 320.

† Dicuntur vero binæ, quia Christum Deum et hominem confitetur. In Prov. xxxi. Opera, vol. 1. p. 1102.

‡ Astringamur autem huic arbore fune validissimo, vincti in spe, fide, charitate, credentes cordibus et oribus confitentes individuum trinitatem, quæ spartum triplex, quod non rumpitur. Ad. Severum, Epist. 4. p. 65.

Gregory Nyssen says, that Is. xlvi. *My hand has made all things*, means the Son\*. In Is. xlvi. 16. We read, *The Lord God, and his Spirit has sent me*. “This,” says Theodoret, “plainly shows that there is “another person besides God, to confute “the Jews and Sabellians†.” The *three holy’s* in Is. vi. 3. are frequently mentioned as signifying the three persons in the trinity, as by Ambrose‡.

So much was it taken for granted that the *logos* was to be understood of *Christ*, that Origen says, “What is the word (*logos*) “that came from the Lord, whether to “Jeremiah, to Isaiah, to Ezekiel, or to any “other, but that which was in the be- “ginning with God. I know no other “word of the Lord, but that which the “evangelist spake of, when he said, In the “beginning was the word, and the word

\* Contra Eunomium 6. Opera, vol. 2. p. 191.

† Καὶ νῦν κυριος, κυριος απεστειλε με, καὶ το πνευμα αυτε ;—  
 σαφως δε ημιν ενταυθα ελεγον εδειξε παρα τε υες προσωπων,  
 εις ελεγχον καὶ των Ιουδαιων, καὶ των τα Σαβελλιε ιουσεβιων.  
 Opera, vol. 2. p. 111.

‡ De Fide lib. 2. cap. 4. Opera, vol. 4. p. 141.



“ was with God, and the word was God\*.”  
The word that came to Hosea, is also interpreted of Christ, by Jerom†.

Austin, after urging many arguments against Photinus, concludes with what he says is alone sufficient, if he be in his right mind, viz. this from Jer. xvii. 5. *Cursed is the man that trusteth in man*‡. But this is, perhaps rather applying a maxim, than urging a particular text, as referring originally to Christ.

Lastly, Cyprian says that, the “ three hours of prayer observed by the three

\* Τις γαρ εστιν ο λογος ο γενομενος παρα κυριου, εις εως Ιερειαν εις εως Ησαιαν, εις εως Ιεζεκιηλ, εις εως ον Δηπολεις ; ο εν αρχη παρος τον Θεον. Εγω εκ οιδα αλλον λογον κυριου, η τετον περι ε ειρηκεν ο ευαγγελιστης. το εν αρχη ην ο λογος, κ' ο λογος ην παρος τον Θεον, κ' Θεος ην ο λογος.  
Comment. in Jer. vol. 1. p. 102.

† Opera, vol. 5. p. 35.

‡ Male dictum plane legis Photinus evadere non potest, quia spem suam habet in Christo, quem tantum hominem dicit, cum legat, maledictus homo qui spem habet in homine. Apostolus autem sciens Christum deum, ideo et in præsenti et in futuro spem esse in eo ait. Quest. ex N. T. 91. Opera, vol. 4. p. 763.

“ who were strong in faith, and the three  
 “ out of the fire,” meaning those who  
 were cast into the fiery furnace in Daniel,  
 “ were emblems of the trinity\*.

## S E C T I O N II.

*Arguments for the Divinity of Christ from the  
 New Testament.*

WHEN the idea of the Divinity of Christ was once formed from the principles of Platonism, it was not difficult to imagine that it was likewise the doctrine of *the scriptures*; and that there were passages in the New Testament no less favourable to it, than those above recited from the Old; though all the books were

\* In orationibus vero celebrandis invenimus observasse cum Daniele tres pueros in fide fortes, et in captivitate victores, horam, sextam, nonam, sacramento scilicet trinitatis: quæ in novissimis temporibus manifestari habebat. Nam et prima hora in tertiam veniens, consummatum numerum trinitatis ostendit. Opera, p. 154.

in

in the hands of the common people, for whose use they were particularly calculated, and *they* saw no such doctrine in it.

The great argument for the divinity of Christ from the New Testament was, that “ though Christ appeared to be a man by “ his infirmities, he appeared to be a god “ by his works,” as it is expressed by Novatian\*. And yet our Saviour himself always ascribes his miraculous works to his Father, and never to himself; and the people who saw those works were not led by them to suspect that he was any thing more than a man; for we only read, that when they were most struck with them, they wondered that God had given such power unto man. Eusebius likewise alledges the spread of the gospel, and its overturning heathenism, as a proof of the divinity of Christ. But by the same kind of argument he might have proved the divinity of Moses.

The two styles in which our Saviour speaks of himself were observed by Origen,

\* Ut homo ex infirmitatibus comprobetur; probatio divinitatis in illo collecta ex virtutibus illuc proficiet, ut etiam deus ex operibus adferatur. Cap. 11. p. 33.

and were considered by him, as they are by the orthodox to this very day, as proofs, the one of his perfect humanity, and the others of his proper divinity. “Jesus,” says he, “sometimes speaks as the first born of all the creation, as when he says,—*I am the way, the truth, and the life*; and sometimes as a man; as when he says, *you seek to kill me, a man who has told you the truth*\*.”

The author of a treatise ascribed to Athanasius, produces thirty arguments to prove that Christ cannot be a mere man; the chief of which are these: “He that was subject to death cannot take away death. No man has glory from eternity; but Christ had. Christ was sinless, but no man is so. The flesh of no man is from heaven, but the flesh of Christ is. A man actuated by God, is not God; but Christ is God†.” A better reason than

\* Οἱ κτλ μεν τινες εἰσὶ φοναῖ τε ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ πρῶτοιοκυ πάσης κήσεον, ας η. Εἰς εἰμι ἡ οδός, καὶ ἡ ἀληθεῖα, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ, καὶ αὐτοῖς παραπληροῖται· αὐτὸς τε καὶ αὐτὸν νοούμενος ἀνθρώπος ας η τε. Νυν δὲ με ζητεῖτε ἀποκτεῖναι ἀνθρώπον ος τὴν ἀληθεῖαν ὑμῖν λέλαληκα. Ad Celsum, lib. 2. p. 76.

† Οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐχέει δοξάν. Χρῖστος δὲ ἐχέει.—Ὁ ἐξ ἀμορφίας ὤζων, ὑπὲρ ἀμαρτίαν εἰσιν· καὶ ὤζει

any of these is given by Austin, who says, that “no man was ever greater than Solomon, but Christ was so \*.” Ambrose gives a curious reason why the father of Jesus should be a carpenter: “It was,” he says, “to signify, that Christ was the son of the “maker of all things †”

Ὡς εἰς χριστός· κθεὶς δὲ ἀνθρώπων ὑπὲρ ἀμαρτίαν. καὶ ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου. ὁ χριστός.—Οὐδενὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ σαρκὶς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ λε-  
λέκται. χρίσε δὲ ἡ σαρκὶς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εἰρηλαί. Ἀνθρώπος ὑπο-  
θεὸς ἐνέργειαν, καὶ θεός, σῶμα δὲ συναρθεῖν θεῷ, θεός.  
θεὸς ὁ χριστός.—Πᾶς ἀνθρώπος ὑποθανάτων, καὶ κθεὶς ὑποθανά-  
των, καταργεῖ θάνατον. Opera, vol. 2. p. 248.

\* Salomoni cum sapientiam a Deo postulasset, responsum a domino est: Ecce dedi tibi, inquit cor sapiens et prudens, quale non fuit ante te, et post te non exurget vir similis tibi. Quid dicemus, verum est quod promissit Deus? Imo verum est. Nemo ergo hominum similis erit Salomoni. Et quid videbit de Christo, qui inter cætera, regina, inquit, austri venit ab ultimis terræ audire sapientiam Salomonis? et ecce plus Salomone hic. Nunc elige cui credas Photine, deo an Christo, patri an filio? Si patri credis arguis filium: si filio credis, accusas patrem. Si enim homo tantum est Christus frustra se præposuit Salomoni contra promissum Dei. Questiones, Ex. T. J. Opera, vol. 4. p. 763.

† Non alienum etiam videtur ut qua ratione fabrum patrem habuerit, declaremus. Hoc enim typo eum patrem sibi esse demonstrat qui fabricator omnium condidit mundum, juxta quod scriptum est, in principio fecit deus cælum et terram. In Luc. 3. Opera, vol. 2. p. 42.

It is the gospel of John that has always furnished the greatest number of proofs of the divinity of Christ, though it is remarkable that, in none of the gospels are there more evident proofs of his proper humanity. But of these no account was made, because they were only considered as proving what was never denied, viz. that Christ had *human nature*. Epiphanius proves the divinity of Christ from the Father being called the *light*, and the Son the *true light*\*.— John the Baptist said, *After me cometh a man, who was before me*. “Here,” says “Theodoret, both the humanity and the divinity of Christ are taught †.”

That it was Christ who spake both in the prophets and in the gospel, Ambrose

\* Καὶ οὐα μοι τὴν τῶν γράφων ἀκριβείαν. ἐστὶ μὲν γὰρ πα-  
τήρ φως, καὶ ἡ προσκείμενη τῷ περὶ πατρὸς, φως ἀληθινόν. ἐπεὶ  
δὲ τῷ περὶ υἱοῦ εἶπε, φως ἀληθινόν, καὶ εὐδεις τόλμα ἄλλως  
λεγεῖν. Ancratus, S. 3. Opera, vol 2. p. 8.

† Καὶ ὁ τῷ τε δεσποτῷ ἐκείνῳ λέγων ὅτι ὀπίσω με ἐρχέσθαι  
ἀνὴρ, ὃς ἐμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, ὅτι πρῶτος μου ἦν. καὶ τὸ ἐν  
προσώπῳ δειξάς ἀμφοτέρω τε δέσποτῳ, καὶ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ τῷ ἀν-  
θρώπινῳ. ἀνθρώπινον μὲν γὰρ, καὶ τὸ, ἀνὴρ καὶ τὸ, ἐρχεται ὁ θεῖος  
δὲ τοῦτο πρῶτος μου ἦν. ἀλλ’ ὁμοίως καὶ ἄλλων οἱ δὲ τὸν ὀπίσω ἐρ-  
χόμενον, καὶ ἄλλον τὸν πρὸ αὐτοῦ ὄντα. Epist. 83. Opera,  
vol. 4. p. 1149. Ed. Halx.

proves

proves from our Saviour's own words, "in  
 " foretelling the gospel by Isaiah, I who  
 " spake am present. (Is. 54. John 16.)  
 " i. e. I am present in the gospel, who  
 " spake in the law \*."

What John represents our Saviour as saying, *I and my Father are one*, and which had been urged by the Sabellians against those who were then deemed orthodox, was now most strenuously urged by the orthodox, in a more advanced state of the controversy, as a clear proof of Christ having proper divinity as well as the Father ; and at the same time, that they did not make *two Gods*.

Origen, interpreting this text, observes, that the Father and Son are two hypotheses, but one in unanimity, harmony, " and will †."

\* Atque ut scias imperator Auguste, Christum esse qui loquutus est et in propheta et in evangelio, tanquam in prædestinatione evangelii per Esaiam dicit: Ipse qui loquebar adsum: hoc est, adsum in evangelio, qui loquebar in lege. De Fide, lib. 2. cap. 3. Opera, vol. 4. p. 134.

† Ορθοσκευομεν εν τον πατερα της αληθειας, και τον υιον την αληθειαν, οντα δυοτη υποσασει πραγματα, εν δε τη ομονοια, και τη συμφωνια, και τη ταυτοτητι τε βελημαίω. Contra Celsum, lib. 8. p. 386.

This text is urged by Novatian\* ; but Hilary makes it to be heretical to interpret this text to mean unity of consent, or harmony, and not sameness of nature †. Ambrose refines upon it, taking notice, that our Saviour places himself before his Father, “left  
“ it should be imagined that he was inferior to him ; whereas it could not be  
“ supposed that the Father was inferior to  
“ the Son ‡.” But what is more extraordi-

\* Si homo tantummodo Christus ; quid est, quod ait, ego et pater unum sumus ? quomodo enim ego et pater unum sumus, si non et deus est et filius ? qui idcirco unum potest dici dum ex ipso est, et dum filius ejus est, et dum ex ipso nascitur, dum ex ipso processisse reperitur, per quod et deus est. Cap. 15. p. 52.

† Hæc igitur quia hæretici negare non possunt, quippe cum sint tam absolute dicta atque intellecta : tamen stultissimo impietatis suæ mendacio negando corrumpunt. Id enim quod ait, ego et pater unum sumus, tentant ad unanimatis referre consensum, ut voluntatis in his unitas sit, non naturæ ; id est, ut non per id quod idem sunt, sed per id quod idem volunt, unum sunt. De Trinit. lib. 8. p. 162.

‡ Pulchre etiam illud præmisit, ego et pater. Nam si patrem præmisisset, tu minorem filium judicares : sed præmisit filium, quem non convenit credi patre superiorem ; Hexameron, lib. 6. cap. 7. Opera, vol. 1. p. 94.



nary than even this, advantage is taken by Basil of Christ saying, *My Father is greater than I.* “It is,” says he, “a proof that  
 “they are both of the same nature because  
 “things of a different nature are not so  
 “compared \*.”

Eusebius retained something of the old ideas on this subject, when he said that the Father and Son are one by a communication of the glory which he imparted to his disciples. For thus they also might be admitted into this unity †.

I shall now proceed to note a few proofs of the divinity of Christ from the apostolic epistles. Paul is supposed to say, that Christ was *God over all blessed for ever,* Rom. ix. 5. This is observed by Nova-

\* Και πάλιν ο πατήρ με μείζων με ἐστίν. κερῆναι γὰρ καὶ τελῶ τῶ ρῆμῳ τὰ ἀχαρίσῃ κλισμὰ, τὰ τε πονερὰ γεννημὰ. ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ ἐκ ταύτης τῆς φωνῆς, τὸ ὁμοῦσιον εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τῷ πατρὶ δηλεῖσθαι πεπιστευκα. τὰς γὰρ συγκρίσεις οἶδα κυρίως ἐπὶ τῶν τῆς αὐτῆς φύσεως γινομένων. ἀγγέλων γὰρ ἀγγέλῳ λεγόμεν μείζονα, καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἀνθρώπῳ δικαιοτέρων, καὶ πῶντων πῶντων ταχυτέρων. εἰ τοίνυν αἱ συγκρίσεις ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμοειδῶν γίνονται· μείζων δὲ καὶ συνκρίσιν εἶρηται ὁ πατήρ τε υἱ, ὁμοῦσιος τῷ πατρὶ ὁ υἱός. Epist. 141. Opera, vol. 3. p. 167.

† Οὕτως ἐν ἐν εἰσιν ὁ πατήρ καὶ ὁ υἱός, καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν τῆς δόξης, καὶ τοῖς αὐτῆς μαθηταῖς μελαδίδες τῆς αὐτῆς ἐνώσεως, καὶ αὐτός ἡξίς. Eccl. Theol. lib. 3. cap. 19. p. 193.

tian, cap. 13. p. 43. and many others. Gregory the Great says, that “ Paul alludes to “ the trinity, in Rom. xi. *of him, and by “ him, and in him, are all things* \*.”

Both Eusebius and Jerom quote Gal. i. 12. *I received not my doctrine from man, as a proof that Christ, from whom he did receive his gospel, was more than man †.*”

Eph. iv. 10. *He that descended, is the same also that ascended*, is urged by Jerom against Ebion and Photinus ‡. Lactantius proves

\* Paulus quoque ut operationem sanctæ trinitatis ostenderet, ait : ex ipso et per ipsum, et in ipso sunt omnia, atque ut unitatem ejusdem trinitatis intimaret, protinus addidit. Ipsi gloria in secula seculorum, amen. In Job. cap. 28. Opera, p. 174. B

† Καὶ πρῶτον, τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐλεγεν, ὅτι, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μὲ, τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς, οὐκ ἐστὶ κατὰ ἀνθρώπον, ὅδε ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον αὐτό, ὅδε ἐδιδάχθην, ἀλλὰ διὰ ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ. Διὼν, αὐτοῖς, ὅτι μὴ ἀνθρώπος ἦν φίλος, Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς παρῆν. Contra Marcel. lib. 1. p. 7.

Ex hoc loco Ebionis et Fotini dogma conteritur : quod deus sit Christus, et non tantum homo. Jerom in Gal. cap. 1. Opera. vol. 6. p. 122.

‡ Hic locus adversum Ebionem et Fotinum vel maxime facit. Si enim ipse est ascendens in cœlos, qui de cœlis ante descenderat, quomodo dominus noster Jesus Christus non ante Mariam est, sed post Mariam. In Eph. cap. 4. Opera, vol. 6. p. 178.

that

that Christ is both God and man, from his being called *the mediator between God and man* \*. Origen applies to Christ, Rev. i. 11. *I am the beginning and the end* †. Chrysostom proves that Christ is equal to the Father from Christ's saying, *I and my Father will come and take up our abode with him*. "Did ever," he says, "a deputy say "concerning his king, *I and my king give orders* ‡."

\* Unde illum Græci μεσιτην vocant; ut hominem perducere ad deum posset, id est, ad immortalitatem: quia si deus tantum fuisset (ut supra dictum est) exempla virtutis homini præbere non posset; si homo tantum, non posset homines ad justitiam cogere, nisi auctoritas, ac virtus homine major accederet. Instit. lib. 4: sect. 25. Opera, p. 430.

† Comment. vol. 2. p. 19.

‡ Εἰ ἐτολμησεν εἰπεῖν ἐπαρχὸς περὶ βασιλεως οτι ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς διατασσομαι. Ser. 4. Opera, vol. 6. p. 35.

## S E C T I O N III.

*Answers to Objections.*

THE reader will be pleased to see in what manner the orthodox Fathers replied to the principal objections made to their doctrine by the heretics of that early age; and therefore, besides what may be collected to this purpose from other parts of this work, I shall in this place subjoin a few other passages.

One of the principal objections to the divinity of Christ was his being so frequently called *a man*. But, besides its being allowed that he was a man as well as God, which they say sufficiently justifies the language, the author of the Commentary on Matthew, which has been ascribed to Chrysostom, says, that “ God the Father  
“ being called a man in our Saviour’s pa-  
“ rable, shows that Christ being called a  
“ man is no objection to his being God \*.”

\* Homo rex dicitur deus pater, qui nunquam humanam suscepit formam: ut intelligamus quia nomen hominis

Another formidable objection to the new doctrine of the divinity of Christ was, that the Father is called *the one God*. But Austin says, “ when Christ is called the “ one Lord, the lordship of the Father is “ not denied ; so when the Father is called “ the one God, the deity of the Son is not “ denied.” Ambrose had said the same before him\*.

Our Saviour says concerning the Father, that he only is *good*, declining the appellation as applied to himself. But, says Athanasius, “ our Saviour said that God “ only was good, because the person he “ was speaking to considered him as a “ man†.” Hilary also says, “ Christ would

*nis præjudicium non facit divinæ suæ naturæ.* In Matt. 22. Hom. 41. Opera, vol. 7. p. 919.

\* Sicut enim unum dicendo dominum Jesum Christum patrem dominum non negavit ; ita unum dicendo deum patrem, æque a deitatis veritate nec filium separavit. *Expositio Fidei*, Opera, vol. 5. p. 514.

† Και οταν λεγει· τι με λεγεις αγαθον· κδεις αγαθος ει μη ο θεος. συναριθμησας εαυτον μετα των ανθρωπων, κατα την σαρκα τετο ειπε, προς τον νυν τε προσελθοντος αυτω. εκεινος γαρ ανθρωπον αυτον ενομιζε μονον η̃ & θεον, η̃ τετον εχει τον νυν η αποκρις. ει μεν γαρ ανθρωπον, φησι, νομιζεις με, και & θεον, μη με λεγε αγαθον· & γαρ διατρεει,

“not have refused the appellation of good,  
 “if it had been offered to him as God\*.”  
 But Austin is not content to reply to this  
 as an objection; he uses it as an argument  
 in proof of the trinity. “Our Saviour,”  
 says he, “did not say there is none good  
 “but the Father; but there is none good  
 “but one, that is God; including him-  
 “self, and the Holy Spirit, as well as the  
 “Father†.” This observation occurs se-  
 veral times in the works of Austin.

The orthodox laid great stress on Christ's  
 being called *the Son of God*, as implying  
 that he was of the *same nature* with God  
 the Father, and therefore that he was pro-  
 perly *God of God*. To this the unita-  
 rians replied, that good men are frequently  
 called the *sons of God*, as well as Christ.

διαφέρει ανθρωπινη φύσει το αγαθον, αλλα θεω. De Hu-  
 manæ Naturæ, Opera, vol. 1. p. 599.

\* Non respuit bonitatis nomen, si sibi hoc tantum deo  
 deputaretur. Lib. 9. p. 197.

† Ideo non ait nemo bonus nisi solus pater, sed nemo  
 bonus nisi solus deus; in patris enim nomine ipse per se  
 pater pronunciat, in dei vero et ipse et filius et spiri-  
 tus sanctus, quia trinitas unus deus. De Trinitate, lib. 5:  
 cap. 8. Opera, vol. 3. p. 320.

But

But the universal answer to this objection was that of Jerom; “Christ is the Son of God by nature, but we by adoption\*.”

It was alledged by the unitarians, as a proof that Christ was inferior to the Father, that he is said to have been *sent* by him, as if he was subject to his authority. But Ambrose says, “the person sent is not always inferior to him that sends him; for then Christ would be inferior to Pilate, who sent him to Herod†.” To this Gennadius adds, that “an angel was sent by Tobiah‡.”

To *come forth from the Father* might be interpreted to mean nothing more than being *sent* by the Father, as other prophets were. But Hilary, taking advantage of the literal meaning of the word, says, “To come from the Father, and to come out

\* Et ille quidem natura filius est, nos vero adoptione. In Eph. cap. 1. Opera, vol. 6. p. 162.

† Esto tamen, minor sit qui mittitur, eo a quo mittitur, ergo et Pilato minor Christus, quoniam Pilatus misit eum ad Herodem. De Fide, lib. 5. cap. 3. Opera, vol. 4. p. 191.

‡ Sicut legimus angelum esse missum a Tobia, et Christus missus est a Pilato ad Herodem. Bib. Pat. vol. 5. p. 445.

“ of God, do not mean the same things.  
 “ They differ as much as *to be born*, and  
 “ *to be present* ; since the one is to come  
 “ from God in his nativity, and the other  
 “ to come from the Father into the world,  
 “ for the salvation of men\*.”

The unitarians always laid great stress on Christ's calling the Father *the one true God*. What answer Tertullian made to this objection we have seen already, viz. that *the one God* was the original title of the Father before he had a Son, and therefore, that his having a Son could not deprive him of it. But the general answer was that of Epiphanius, viz. “ that the Father is called the  
 “ one true God, in opposition to the gods  
 “ of the heathens†.” On this subject Jerom farther observes, that “ Christ is also called

\* A patre enim venisse, et a deo exisse, non est significationis ejusdem : et quantum interest inter nasci et adesse tantum a se uterque fermo discernitur ; cum aliud sit a deo in substantia nativitatis exisse, aliud sit a patre in hunc mundum, ad consummanda salutis nostræ sacramenta, venisse. Lib. 6. p. 118.

\* Εν τῷ ἐν εἰπεῖν τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν, εἰς μοναρχίαν ἡμᾶς ἔγραψεν \* ἵνα μὴ κέτι ὑπὸ τὰ σοιχρία τὰ κοσμος ὡμῶν δεδωλαμένοι, ἵνα μὴ πολυθεία ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστὶ &c. Sect. 2. Opera, vol. 2. p. 7.

“ the



“ the true God, 1 John v. *We are in him that is true, this is the true God, and eternal life\*.*” But Austin even proves the divinity of Christ from this text. For he says, it ought to be read, “ that they may know thee, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent, to be the true God †.”

It was objected to the doctrine of the divinity of Christ that he said, *he could do nothing of himself.* But Isidore of Pelusium says, that “ this intimated not his weakness, but his strength, as it shewed that he would do nothing contrary to his Father” (meaning, no doubt, that it was in his power) “ as he had fallen under a suspicion of being the antagonist of God, and of appropriating glory to himself ‡.”

\* Non secundum errorem Arianorum referimus ad personam tantum dei patris de quo scriptum est : ut cognoscent te solum verum deum, et quem misisti Jesum Christum : sed ad filium, qui et ipse verus deus est, dicente evangelista Johanne ; venit filius dei et dedit nobis mentem, ut cognoscamus verum, et simus in vero filio ejus Jesu Christo. Ille est verus deus et vita æterna. Opera, vol. 4. p. 219.

† Ut hæc sit sententia, te, et quem misisti Jesum Christum, cognoscant unum verum deum. Epist. 174. Opera, vol. 2. p. 785.

‡ Το γὰρ, & δύναται ο υιος ποιειν αφ' εαυτης εδεν, εκ αδθενειαν αυτης παληγορει, αλλα & μεγαλην βωμην, ολι ανεπιδεκλος εστι τς ενανθιον τι τω

It was objected to the divinity of Christ, that *he prayed to the Father*, as one who was dependent upon him. The general answer to this objection is thus expressed by Damascenus, “Christ being personally united  
“ to God, has no need of that ascent of the  
“ mind to God in which prayer consists;  
“ but having taken human nature upon  
“ him, he shewed us a pattern of what was  
“ proper for us to do\*.” “The *glory* that  
“ Christ prayed for,” says Hilary, “was  
“ not for the word, but for the flesh†.”  
“ But Ruffinus says, “Christ was praying

παρὶ ποιεῖν. ἐπεὶ δὲ γὰρ ὑπὸ πνεύμῳ παρ’ αὐτῶν ὡς ἀνθρώπος, καὶ ἀλλο-  
τρίαν σφειλεριζόμενος δοξάν, τὸ εἶπεν. Ep. lib. 3. p. 387.

\* Oratio est mentis ad deum ascensus: aut eorum a deo postulatio, quæ postulare convenit. Qui ergo fiebat, ut dominus in Lazari suscitatione, ac passionis tempore, preces adhiberet? Neque enim sancta ipsius mens ascensione ad deum opus habebat, quippe quæ semel deo personaliter unita esset: nec rursus ei opus erat, ut quicquam a deo postularet. Unus enim Christus est. Nimirum igitur id causæ erat, quod personam nostram sibi ad seisceret, atque id quod nostrum erat, in seipso exprimeret, sequæ exemplar nobis præberet, nosque a deo postulare, mentesque ad eum erigere doceret. Orthod. Fid. lib. 3. cap. 23. p. 426.

† Gloria enim omnis non verbo, sed carni acquirebatur. Lib. 5. p. 211.

“ for

“ for his body the church, when he said,  
 “ *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken*  
 “ *me \*?*”

Our Saviour expressly says that his Father was greater than he. But this was generally explained by saying, that he referred to his human nature only. This is the reply of Athanasius, who says, that “ being  
 “ the logos of the Father, he was at the same  
 “ time equal to him †.” But Epiphanius intimates that our Saviour said this as a mere compliment to the Father, such as became a son to make ‡. In the Ancoratus, he says, it was to prove that Christ was the genuine son of the Father ||.

What Paul says concerning the *subjection of Christ to the Father*, who put all things

\* Suscepit mortem pro nobis, et nos fecit corpus suum, pro quo orat ad patrem, cum dicit, deus deus meus, respice in me, quare me dereliquisti? In Ps. xxi. Opera, vol. 2. p. 45.

† Και οτε λεγει ο πατηρ ης ο υπερβας με μειζων ης εστιν επι ανθρωπος γεγονεν μειζω αυτη λεγει τον πατερα. λογος δε ων τς πατρος, ισος αυτη εστιν. De Humana Natura, Opera, vol. 1. p. 597.

‡ Τιμ γαρ επρεπε δοξάζειν ιδιον πατερα αλλα τω γνησιω υιω. Hær. 62. Opera, vol. 1. p. 516.

|| Εδει γαρ αληθως τον γνησιον υιον τιμην τον ιδιον πατερα ινα δειξη την γνησιότητα. Ancoratus, Opera, vol. 2. p. 23.

*under his feet* (1 Cor. xv. 24.) was made an objection to the trinitarians, as implying that Christ was certainly inferior to the Father, and that his kingdom was to have an end. “Very many,” says Hilary, “think “that when all things are subjected to “him, Christ will be subject to God; that “on account of this subjection he is not “God\*.” Of this difficulty many solutions were proposed, and some of them curious enough.

Chrysostom says, that “when Paul spake “of the subjection of the Son to the Fa- “ther, he was afraid lest some unreasonable “persons should imagine either that the “Son was greater than the Father, or that “there was another unbegotten principle “(αρχη)†.” Damiani says, that “to deli- “ver up the kingdom to God even the Fa- “ther, means bringing men to contemp-

\* Plerique enim ita volunt, ut aut dum subjectis omnibus deo subicitur, per conditionem subjectionis deus non sit. De Trinitate, lib. 11. p. 282.

† Εφοβηθη λοιπον μη δια τειλο δεξη παρα τισι των αλογολερων, η μειζων ειναι τε πατρως ο υιος, η ετερα τις αρχη αγεννης. In 1 Cor. 15. Opera, vol. 9. p. 680.

“late

“late the Father\*.” Gregory Nyssen says, that “the subjection of Christ to the Father, means the subjection of the body of Christ, which is his church†.” He afterwards says, “his body is all human nature, with which he is mixed‡.” This last idea will receive some illustration from what I have observed with respect to the supposed *use* of the incarnation of the *logos*.

However, it was the general opinion of the Fathers, that Christ will not cease to reign when all things shall be put under him. Eusebius says, “Christ does not cease to reign when he delivers the kingdom to God the Father||.” Jerom says, “Christ will rather begin than cease to reign, when his enemies shall be put un-

\* Cum tradere regnum deo patri nihil aliud sit juxta sobrium intellectum, nisi perducere credentes ad contemplandam speciem dei patris Epist. Bib. Pat. App. p. 485.

† Και εως η τε σωματος τε εις υποταγη, αυτε λεγεται ειναι τε εις υποταγη, τε ανακειραμενος προς το ιδιον σωμα, οπερ εστιν η εκκλησια. In 1 Cor. xv. 28. Opera, vol. 1. p. 847.

‡ Σωμα δε αυτε, καθως ειρηται πολλοις, πως η ανθρωπινη φυσις, η καλειμχθη. Ibid. p. 849.

|| Βασιλευων δε τοτε ο υιος τε θες, τες υπ' αυτω βασιλευμενες παντας, τω αυτε παραδωσει πατρι, ε πανταμμενος της βασιλειας, εδ' αναχωρων αυτης. Ec. Theol lib. 3. cap. 16. p. 187.

“der his feet\*,” meaning, probably, that all obstacles would then be removed, and that he would reign in peace; and in this, many of the moderns concur with him.

The orthodox were not a little embarrassed with Christ’s saying, that places at his right hand and at his left, were not his to give, but that they would be bestowed as his Father pleased. Basil of Seleucia says, “this is to be understood as if he had said, “you are not worthy to receive it, shew me “your deserts, and then I will shew my “power†.” To the same purpose, Cyril of Alexandria says, that “those places were “not to be given at all, but were to be the “reward of merit‡.”

\* Num quid tamdiu regnaturus est dominus, donec incipiant esse inimici sub pedibus ejus; et postquam illi sub pedibus fuerint, regnare desistet, cum utique tunc magis regnare incipiet, cum inimici cæperint esse sub pedibus.

Ad. Helvid. Opera, vol. 2 p. 311.

† Και νυν λεγεις, εκ εστιν εμον θναι; δια τι; επειδη της τε λαμ-  
βανοντος αξιας, & της τε διδοντος εξεστιας μινεν το δωρον. καμαλων αθ-  
λον ο θρονος, & φιλοτιμιας το χαρισμα. εκ καλορθωματων ο θρονος, εκ  
εξ αιησεως η δοσις. δειξον μοι την σην αξιαν, κ’ βλεπε την εμην εξε-  
σιαν. Or. 24. Opera, p. 135.

‡ Non est meum dare: non enim certandi munera sic mihi proposita sunt ut velim petentibus dare quibuscunque,

After this fair exhibition of the doctrine of the trinity from the writers of the age in which it was advanced ; having seen the absurdity of the principles from which it originated, and the still greater absurdities into which it was afterwards carried ; and also after seeing the wretched illustrations, and miserable defences that were made of it, can we wonder at its being sometimes treated with ridicule, and sometimes regarded with abhorrence, by the unitarians of that age ; or that it should have exposed christianity to the derision of unbelievers, notwithstanding it was originally calculated to gain over the more philosophical part of them. The orthodox made heavy complaints on this subject, of which several specimens have been given already. They particularly say, that they did not know how to speak of Christ without giving an advantage to some or other of their adversaries. “ If Christ,” says Jerom, “ be  
“ called a man, Ebion and Photinus take

sed illis solum qui certando superabunt. Thesaurus, lib. 10. cap. 5. Opera, vol. 2. p. 300.

“ the advantage ; if he be called a god,  
 “ Manes and Marcion †.”

“ With respect to the divinity of Christ,”  
 says Photius, “ to acknowledge three ef-  
 “ fences is polytheism, and consequently  
 “ atheism, and to assert one hypostasis, is  
 “ Judaism and Sabellianism. And with  
 “ respect to his humanity, to say there is  
 “ one nature and one hypostasis, is Mani-  
 “ chæism, and to say that there are two  
 “ natures and two hypostases, is Pauli-  
 “ anism ‡.”

The orthodox were charged with hold-  
 ing different opinions concerning the tri-  
 nity, and a great variety of such opinions  
 have been exhibited. Gregory Nazianzen  
 denies this, and says, that “ the difference in  
 “ other things, which he allows, was not so

\* Si Christum fateatur hominem, Ebion, Fotinus que  
 subrepunt ; si deum esse contenderit : Manichæus et Mar-  
 cion. In Gal. cap. 1. Opera, vol. 6. p. 120.

† Ωςπερ επι της θεολογιας, κ̅ι το, τρεις ομολογειν υ̅σις, πολυθεον  
 κ̅ι δια τ̅ελο αδεν • κ̅ι το μιαν λεγειν υποστασιν, Ιουδαικον κ̅ι Σαβελλιον •  
 ε̅λω κ̅ι επι της οικονομιας, το τε μιαν φυσιν φρονειν κ̅ι μιαν υποστασιν  
 Μανιχαικον κ̅ι αποβλητον • κ̅ι το δυο φυσεις, κ̅ι δυο υποστασεις, Παυ-  
 λιανιστων κ̅ι μισοχριστων. Epist. p. 95.

“ great



“ great as their adversaries pretended, that  
 “ they were in part composed, and would be  
 “ entirely so\*.” They were, however,  
 no farther composed than the authority of  
 councils, and that of the civil powers, were  
 able to do it; and this prophecy concerning  
 the total cessation of those differences has  
 never been fulfilled, nor is there any pro-  
 spect that it ever will.

From the very beginning it has been  
 seen that the orthodox were charged with  
 making more gods than one. This appears  
 by the apologies which all the orthodox  
 writers make on this subject. Among  
 others, see Novatian†. And this com-

\* Ου γαρ περι θεότητος διττεχθημεν, ἀλλ’ ὑπερ εὐταξίας ηἰγωνισα-  
 μεθα, ὅδ’ ὅποτέραν δεῖ τῶν ἀσεβείων ἐλεσθαι μάλλον ἠμφισβήτησαμεν,  
 εἴτε τὴν συνάρξασαν θεόν, ἢ τὴν τεμενέσαν· εἴτε τὸ πνεῦμα μόνον ἀπὸ τῆς  
 θεϊκῆς ἰσχύος, εἴτε τὸν υἱὸν πρὸς τὸ πνεῦμα, τὴν μίαν μοῖραν, ἢ τὰς  
 δύο τῆς ἀσεβείας. ταῦτα γὰρ ὡς ἐν κεφαλῇ περιλαβεῖν, τὰ νῦν ἀρρω-  
 σημάτια.—Ἀλλ’ ὑπερ μὲν θεότητος, συμφρονέμεν τε καὶ συμβαίνομεν,  
 ἔχῃ ἥτιον ἢ πρὸς ἐαυτὴν ἢ θεότης. (εἰ μὴ μέγα τέλο εἴπειν) καὶ γεγονημεν.  
 —Ἀλλὰ δὲ εἰν ὑπερ ὧν διττεχθημεν. κακῶς μὲν καὶ περὶ τελῶν, καὶ γὰρ  
 ἀρνησομαι. τὰ μὲν οὖν ἡμετέρα ἡμεῖς ἐν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς καὶ διαλελυμένα καὶ  
 διαλυσομένα. Ἐγὼ τῆς εἰρήνης ἐγγύτης, ὁ μικρὸς τε τοσάυτε πρᾶγ-  
 ματος. Or. 13. Opera, p. 207.

† Et imprimis illud retorquendum in istos qui duorum  
 nobis deorum controversiam fecere præsumunt. Cap. 30.  
 p. 118.

plaint continued till the latest periods, and appears not to have been less after the council of Nice than before. Basil says, “We are accused of blasphemy against “God\*.” There is extant, a whole tract of Basil’s against those who calumniated the orthodox, on account of their worshipping three Gods†.

Gregory Nyssen complains, that he and his friends were “accused of preaching “three Gods, that this accusation was “founded in the ears of the multitude, “and made to appear very plausible to “them‡.”

In a Commentary on the book of Job, published among the works of Origen, but written probably by some Arian, we have heavy complaints of the trinitarian doctrine, called the heresy of three Gods, as a

\* Εγκαλημεθα γαρ την εις θεον βλασφημιαν. Epist. 79. Opera, vol. 3. p. 140.

† Om. 28. Opera, vol. 1. p. 534.

‡ Τρεις θεος πρεσβευεσθαι παρ ημων αιωνιωσι, κη περιηκουσι τας ακρας των πολλων, κη τιθανωσ καλασμευαζονις την διαβολην ταυτην, & πανονται. De Trinitate, vol. 2 p. 433.

type of which the devil made three horns, or three bands, to plunder Job. It has, he says, filled the whole world, as with darkness \*.

The writer of the Homilies on Matthew, falsely ascribed to Chrysostom, frequently inveighs against the doctrine of the trinity; speaking of it as the heresy foretold by Christ to overspread the world, under the emblem of *briars* and *thorns*; and alluding to the word *tribulus*, he calls it *the triangular heresy* †.

\* Tria cornua fecit diabolus in typum atque figuram trionymæ sectæ, triumque deorum hæresis, quæ universum orbem terræ in modum tenebrarum replevit, quæ patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum aliquando tres colit, nonnunquam unum adorat, quemadmodum Græcorum lingua memoratur: triada vel homousion. Istam ergo trinitatis sectam et hæresim atque in fidelitatem jam olim de longe designans versutissimus ille diabolus tria cornua misit ad Job deprædandum, sic namque etiam nunc memorata trionyma hæresis, præsertim prædatur atque expugnat ecclesiam. Lib. I. vol. I. p. 393.

† Et verum est quidem, quia spinas et tribulos omnes iniquos hæreticos appellavit: tamen forsitan sciens dominus hanc hæresim esse prævalituram præ omnibus tribulos eos appellavit, quasi trinitatis professores, et triangularem impietatem in sua perfidia bajulantes. Hom. 19. p. 842.

Nor were the heathens less backward than the christians to upbraid the orthodox Fathers with their own polytheism, while they pretended to reclaim them from theirs. The heathens, according to Chrysostom, would say to them, “ Who is this Father, “ who is this Son, or this Holy Spirit? “ Do not you make three Gods, while you “ accuse us of polytheism \* ?”

In ridicule of the christian doctrine of the trinity, one of the speakers in Lucian’s *Philopatris*, bidding the other to swear “ by “ the Supreme God, by the Son of the Fa- “ ther, and by the Spirit proceeding from “ the Father, one out of three, and three “ out of one, and to consider it as being Ju- “ piter ;” the other answers, “ You make “ me have recourse to numeration, and give “ me an arithmetical oath — I know not “ what you say, *one three, and three one* †.”

\* Αν τοιουνν ερηται τις ελληνων τις ποτε εστιν ελος ο πατηρ ; τις δε ο υιος ; τις δε το πνευμα το αγιον ; η πως κη υμεις τρεις λεγοντες θεες ημιν εγκαλεει πολυθειαν. In John 1. Opera, vol. 8. p. 91.

† Και τινα επομοσωμαι γε ; Τρι. υψιμεδοντα θεον, μεγαν, αμβροτον, αφανηνα, υιον πατρος, πνευμα εκ πατρος εκπορευομενον, εν εκ τριων, κη εξ εως τρια ταυτα νομιζε. Ζητα τονδ’ ηγε θεον. Κρι. αριθμειν με διδασκεις, κη ορκος η αριθ. μηλην. κη γαρ αριθμεις ως Νικομαχος ο γε-  
ρασιγνος.

Julian, who had himself been educated a christian, and was acquainted with the scriptures, charges the orthodox with grossly misrepresenting them, in order to make out their favourite doctrine of the divinity of Christ. To shew in what light he considered their conduct, I shall quote several passages from his writings. “Moses,” he says, “taught one only God, and said, “that he had many sons, to whom the “countries were distributed; but no only “begotten Son, no God the logos, such as “you afterwards falsely substituted. This he “neither knew from the first, nor taught\*.” “If he would have no one to be worshipped, “why do you worship his Son, and one “whom he never considered as his proper “Son, as I can easily show; but you, I do “not know how, have obtruded him†.”

ραστηνος. κα οἶδα γὰρ τι λέγεις, ἐν τρία, τρία ἐν. Opera, vol. 2: p. 998.

\* Ἐνα καὶ μόνον ἐδίδασκει θεόν, υἱὸς δὲ αὐτοῦ πολλὰς τὰς κοίλανεμα-  
μενὰς τὰ ἐθνη· πρῶτον δὲ υἱόν, ἢ θεόν λόγον. ἢ τῶν ἀφ’ ὑμῶν ὑπερὸν  
ψευδῶς συνθεθέντων δὲ, εἰς ἡδὲ κατ’ ἀρχὴν, εἰς ἐδίδασκει φανερώς. Cy-  
ril contra Jul. Juliani, lib. 8. Opera, vol. 2. p. 290.

† Εἰ γὰρ εὐδὲνα θέλει προσκυνηθῆναι, τὰ χάριν τοῦ υἱοῦ τάλον προσκυ-  
νεῖτε, καὶ οὐ ἐκεῖνος ἰδίον εἰς ἐνομίσειν, εὐ πηγήσατο πτωχόλε; καὶ δεῖξω γὰρ  
τάλο

He reproaches the christians with calling Jesus the logos of God \*. Speaking to them he says, “ you are so unfortunate as not to  
 “ abide by what was taught by the apostles,  
 “ but have added things that are worse,  
 “ and more impious to those that were  
 “ held before. For neither Paul, nor Mat-  
 “ thew, nor Luke, nor Mark, dared to  
 “ call Jesus God, but only that good man  
 “ John †.”

He tells them that the doctrine of the divinity of Christ is not to be found in the Old Testament. Speaking of the prophecy of Isaiah, ch. vii. 4, &c. he says, “ he does  
 “ not say that a virgin shall bring forth a  
 “ god, but you always call Mary the mo-  
 τελο ραδιως. υμεις δε. εκ οιδ’ οθεν, υποβληθην αυτω προσιθειε. Ibid.  
 lib. 5. vol. 2. p. 159.

\* Και τεινων μεν των θεων εδενα προσκυνην τοιμαλιε · ον δε ελε οι υμεις ελε οι πατρες υμων εωρακασιν Ισχυν οισσδε χρησιζει θεον λογον υπαρχειν. Epist. 51. Opera, vol. 1. p. 434.

† Ουτω δε εσε δυσυχεις. ωσε εδε τοις υπο των αποστολων υμιν παρα-  
 δεδομενοις εκμεμενηκατε, κη ταυτα δε επι το χειρον κη δυσεβεστερον. υπο  
 των επιγνωμενων εξειργασθη. τον γυν Ιησυν ελε Παυλος εισλημσεν ειπειν  
 θεον ελε Ματθαιου ελε Λουκας. ελε Μαρκου · αλλ’ ο χρηστος Ιωαννης,  
 αυθρομενου ηδη πολυ πληθου εαλωμος εν πολλαις των ελληνιδων κη  
 Ιταλιωιδων πολεων υπο ταυτης ηης νοσθ. Cyril contra Jul. lib.  
 10. Juliani, Opera, vol. 2. p. 327.

“ ther

“ther of God. Where does he say that  
 “he who shall be born of a virgin, shall  
 “be the only begotten son of God, the  
 “first born of all creation? As to what is  
 “said by John, *all things were made by him,*  
 “*and without him was not any thing made*  
 “*that was made*, can any person shew this  
 “in the prophets? But attend to what I  
 “can shew out of them. O Lord God  
 “possess us, we know no other besides  
 “thee. King Hezekiah is represented by  
 “them as praying, O Lord God of Israel,  
 “who sittest upon the cherubim, thou  
 “art God alone. He leaves no room for  
 “any other\*.”

From this passage it is evident that Julian understood the scriptures much better than the orthodox Fathers. But he was

\* Μητι θεον φησιν εκ της παρθενια τεχθησεσθαι; θεοιοκον δε υμεις  
 & παυεσθε Μαριαν καλιντες. η μη πως φησι τον εκ της παρθενια γεν-  
 νωμενον υιον θεα μονογενη η πρωτοτοκον πασης κτισews; αλλα το λεγο-  
 μενον υπο Ιωαννης \* παντα δι αυτης εγενετο, η χωρις αυτης εγενετο οδε εν.  
 εχει τις εν ταις προφητικαις δειξαι φωναις; α δε ημεις δεικνυμεν, εξ  
 αυτων επεινων εξης ακριβε. Κυριε ο θεος ημων κησαι ημας, εκλος σε  
 αλλον ημ οιδαμεν. πεποιηται δε παρ αυτων η Εξεχιας ο βασιλευς  
 ευχομενος. Κυριε ο θεος Ισραηλ, ο καθημενος επι των χειρδω, συ ει  
 ο θεος μονος. μητι τω δευτερω καταλειπεται χωραν. Cyril contra  
 Julianum, lib. 8. Juliani, Opera, vol. 2. p. 262.

acquainted

acquainted with Photinus, and therefore, must have known that *all* the christians were not such absurd interpreters of the scriptures, or such favourers of polytheism. But the public reproaches of christianity, must always fall on the most *conspicuous* professors of it, and those who, in consequence of having the countenance of government, will always be the most numerous. And while the absurd polytheism, the rise and progress of which I have described, had this great advantage, it set at equal defiance the indignation of the oppressed unitarians, and the sneers of the unbelieving heathens.

After what has been exhibited in this work, we cannot wonder at the complaint of Ruffinus, who says, “the Pagans are  
“wont to object to us that our religion,  
“being deficient in reason, consists in the  
“mere force of believing\*.”

Having given so much attention to the doctrine of the trinity; having traced it from its rise; having followed it through

\* Pagani nobis objicere solent quod religio nostra. quia rationibus deficit, in sola credendi persuasione, consistat. In Symbol. p. 171.



all its variations, and seen what its original advocates were able to say in its defence, I shall in the next place invite my reader to give the same impartial attention to the history of the ancient unitarians. This, however, will be attended with the melancholy reflection, that while the greatest and most alarming of all errors kept taking deeper root, and flourished under the protection of the wisdom and power of the world, the simple truth of the gospel was almost confined to the unlearned, who were first despised, and then cruelly persecuted, till, in the age of ignorance, barbarity, and antichristian tyranny, that overspread the christian world, it was nearly exterminated. A vigorous seed, however, remained alive, *the scriptures* which taught that doctrine were not lost, and in more favourable circumstances (prepossessed as the minds of men were in favour of extraneous doctrines) they came to be better understood; and then the first, the greatest, and the clearest of all religious truths began to be perceived. Its advocates are now increasing

every day ; so as to give us the glorious prospect of *unitarianism* being in time, the belief of all the christian world. And this, we doubt not, will be followed by a still more glorious event, that of the whole world becoming christian.

END OF THE SECOND VOLUME.







